The Forum

MAY, 1894.

A YEAR OF DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION.

THE two leading political parties in the country have been more clearly at issue on important principles and policies the last few years than at any time since the civil war and the legislation immediately following it. The issue between them has not been merely over details of administration, or even a single great economic question; nor has it been limited to the personnel of its leaders, their integrity, or capacity in power. It is and has been far more fundamental, involving widely different views of the power, purpose, and scope of government. The merit and success of either party are not, therefore, to be judged by any single act, however good or bad, and certainly not by events over which it has no control, nor by passing prejudices adroitly aroused for partisan purposes, which do not go to the merits of a question or profess to test the main purposes and principles of a political party. I do not say that such collateral matters may not damage a party. On the contrary, it is certain that they do. A bad executive appointment goes to the debit side of the party's account with the people, but it is only an item in the account. Hard times are quite as hard for the party in power as for the country, but this fact does not settle or even touch the question of responsibility for them. Hauling down the American flag anywhere excites popular prejudice at once, but the final decision is determined by what national honor and justice demanded. The passage of a bad law or the refusal to pass a good one is an important, hurtful fact, but more important are the whole purpose, spirit, and policy of a party. Assuming this, one naturally protests against the kind of criticism which magnifies the little thing, overlooks the greater, seeks to bring home

Copyright, 1893, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a party strangers who never started from its doors, and which relies for success upon ignorance and prejudice rather than upon the careful, deliberate judgment of a just and intelligent people. It is not the one, but the one hundred appointments which determine the character of an administration. The little fly which, lighting on the dome of St. Peter's, looked over its half-inch of space, and, detecting a flaw, condemned the building, was not accepted by Carlyle, nor has it been since, as setting a proper standard of criticism upon any subject,—least of all upon public matters where the duty is imperative for political leaders to deal honestly with the people, and where, fortunately, a breach of this duty brings discredit to them, and finally defeat to their party.

This protest is but preliminary to the admission, which fairness demands, that a Democratic administration, after a year of full power and responsibility, and a year of most bitter and unjust opposition, unfortunately aided by some internal dissensions, finds itself harassed and the people discontented. But, to its credit be it said, it stands true to the principles and policy which the people demanded through it should be made the law of the land. By this mandate the Democratic party has been charged with the responsibility of eradicating abuses which through a long series of years have crept into power; of reversing a policy which is believed to be hostile to the interests of the people; and of establishing their government again on the principles of justice, equality, and economy. Its work is both to repeal and to construct, and the first is preliminary and necessary to the last. If it proceeds slowly, it should be remembered that the task is great, and ought to be done carefully, deliberately, without unnecessary violence or injury. A world is not reformed in a day. An established policy, affecting deeply many and varied interests, cannot be changed at once. Democrats are not iconoclasts, however much this is desired of them by political opponents and treacherous friends. If they destroy, it is for the purpose of changing and constructing on a better and safer basis, and not for destruction merely. In such work it is a duty and necessity to proceed carefully, even in dealing with long-established abuses and radical wrongs, and in providing the proper remedy for them. If there was no fundamental difference of principle between the parties, the test of success might well be the capacity of each in dealing with the details of administration, or its speed in the execution of public business, or the efficiency of its leaders,—all important considerations, but not the most impor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tant, if larger matters divide the parties and fill the public mind. In the days of agitation before the war, and in the midst of war itself, how much attention, comparatively, was given to other subjects than those which dealt with slavery and the preservation of the Union? How far were parties or public men affected by other considerations? Repeatedly since have whole sections of our country been controlled in their political action by some supreme question vitally affecting their local institutions or local interests, without regard to the many but subordinate differences which might exist. The whole political history of the past proves, as common sense suggests, that the public mind ought not to be and cannot be diverted from judging men and parties fundamentally rather than by superficial and trivial acts, good or bad.

I am aware that this is not the belief or practice of many politicians. To them some miserable bit of demagogism, an appeal to passing prejudice, some clever tactical move, an office here or compromise there, are made of large importance, while personal politics and an opponent's embarrassment are accepted as the test of success and the full measure of party progress. But leadership by tactics rather than ideas is short-lived, of little public value, and destructive of permanent party success. All will agree that the campaigns of the past few years have changed this, and have been a public benefit in lifting politics out of this rut of personalities and tactics to the higher plane of principle and statesmanship; *and from this higher plane party success is now to be tested and measured.* There is no place there for petty criticism, personal politics, sectional prejudice, or even for factional discord, except as it impedes efficiency and progress. Rather it is the domain of ideas and policies, where in the conflict the side will win which has the truest conception of just and beneficent government, and which most faithfully represents and serves the people's interests.

I plead for this larger view of party work and responsibility not in the spirit of confession and apology. If the Democratic party is to be arraigned before the people upon petty charges, or for offences it did not commit, or for the misfortune of receiving as its inheritance a bankrupt Treasury, an unstable currency, economic and financial policies destructive and discredited, internal troubles tempered only by "Jingoism" and the burden of extravagance fastened by the past on the future, its defence is easy and ready. An administration and President, taking a country stripped, embarrassed, on the verge of a finan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cial crisis, have with characteristic courage, fidelity, and patriotism faced the situation and planned for its relief. They have not fully cured the evil. No: nor does the farm wasted by the improvident tenant at once respond to the skill and work of careful husbandry. But such discussion I suggest will only be "the crimination and recrimination of adverse parties," settling, solving nothing, and of little public benefit. The people now, looking beyond men to things, brushing aside tactics for principles, finding an important issue on essentials, insist upon their consideration, and will judge an administration by the justice and success of its policy and its honest determination to make that policy dominant. All else becomes comparatively unimportant. In this broader view I mean briefly to review the administration of the past year, and in rough outline to consider what duty rested upon the party and how faithfully it has met it.

Every political change of administration directed by the people since the war has been the culmination of acts and events, carefully considered, which have formed in the popular mind a deep-settled conviction that such change was necessary. In 1876 there was expressed the mature, deliberate judgment that the Republican party, under successive administrations, had become corrupt, inefficient, incapable of reform; that public matters had drifted to the low ebb of personal politics, controlled by "Cæsarism," sectionalism, "Jingoism." Bayonet rule in the South, the San Domingo fiasco, the Whiskey Ring, and Credit Mobilier scandal, investigations involving high officials and exposing discredited and irresponsible favorites, were but instances to prove a general state of affairs obnoxious to the country, condemned by the conscience of the Republican party as shown in repeated revolts, and finally by the people. The peculiar circumstances which then continued that party in power necessitated a decided and wholesome change,—first in the treatment of the South, and next in the *morale* and character of the administration. The party was put upon its good behavior, and so continued until in 1884 it showed by its nominations that it had relapsed to its old life, and was still guided and governed by the same old and baleful influences. Then it was thrust from power because the people believed that the most important question was reform,—radical reform,—purity and honesty in government; and they chose the most conspicuous and courageous reformer to execute this their determined purpose. Then came the election of 1888, again the decision of the people on the most pressing question of the day, but now an economic question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

involving not persons but policies. While the decision then was affected by false issues and scares, yet no doubt it was considered to be a severe though hasty condemnation of the Democratic position on the tariff. Then came the years of discussion and education, successive campaigns with one question—and practically but one—considered, debated, decided. I do not need to review those years, except briefly to show the nature of the question and what its decision meant and required.

The people had noticed a great increase in wealth, but gross inequality in its distribution; their attention had not been called pointedly to the fact that this was due largely to unjust legislation. They saw and felt the growing discontent of great masses of the people. They regretted but admitted the rise of a class feeling, the clash of industries and interests, sectional discord and division. They knew that taxation for revenue and purposes of war had been increased for protection amidst profound peace; but to them it was a new doctrine that taxation could be levied for protection only, for private interests rather than public revenue and purposes. Groping about in darkness, they tried ineffectual and often foolish remedies. Then the darkness lifted, and with clear vision they traced effect to cause, and saw national legislation creating, by taxation, wealth for some and burdens to others. They carefully, thoroughly studied the situation, the history of such legislation, the reasons for it, its results, and the broader, more fundamental question of the right and power of government thus to discriminate between its citizens. The mushroom growth of trusts following on the heels of such legislation, and created for a like purpose and upon a like principle; the clamorous demands of special interests for the use of the taxing power as necessary for their prosperity and profit; the insidious, selfish influences they set at work; their control of a great party, and their presence on the political field as a fighting force for it, and through it for themselves only; the natural demand that such legislation should not be limited to the manufacturer, but must be extended to the farmer, the silver-mine owner, and to any one else who had the power and disposition to control it,—these were some of the object-lessons which defined the character, purpose, and result of a protective policy, and awoke the people to a full sense of their own danger. Then they deliberately and emphatically determined that if such a policy, with its mischievous results and burdensome injustice, was not contrary to law, they would make it so, and the Democratic party, their champion, was made the instrument to do their will.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The election of 1892 considered and decided this the one question uppermost in the minds of the people, as clearly as the election of 1860 dealt with slavery, or the election of 1864 with a vigorous prosecution of the war.

Here, then, was the duty marked out for the Democratic party. By its principles and professions, its platforms and campaigns, and by the will of the people twice deliberately and emphatically expressed, it was to change the tariff policy of the country; and this not alone as a just and wise settlement of an economic question, but as a proper limitation upon a great power of government which had been perverted and abused for personal and selfish ends. *As this was and is its chief duty, so fidelity to this duty is the vital test of the success of its administration.* Of course other matters also claim attention and bring responsibility. A wise financial policy, economy and integrity in administration, civil-service reform, prudent management of our foreign relations,—all are important, but subordinate to the main purpose of the party and the work entrusted to it. Failure in this work is fatal. The cause is too important and urgent to be defeated by partisan obstruction, too sacred to Democracy to be betrayed in the house of its friends.

How far and fully has the Democratic party met this its imperative duty? It has with reasonable dispatch framed and put upon its passage legislation to this end. It has in such legislation properly recognized the necessity of proceeding slowly, carefully, in any great reform touching many and varied interests; but it has radically and permanently changed the tariff policy of the country. In this it has turned the country right-about-face, and how fast she marches is not so important as that she marches steadily in the right direction. But the critic, within or without the party, says, "Your tariff bill does not come up to your platform declaration." No, the platform set the goal which the party believed the country would eventually reach; and the experience of 1846 and 1857 seems to justify the belief. It did not undertake to say, nor does any sensible man believe, that the best way to reach the goal is by one exhaustive effort; but rather to make a start, and then guide the speed with all the aid experience can give. The important fact is the change of policy, and the benefit of the change is both economic and in the separation of government and taxation from the control of private interests and selfish influences. Bastiat said of protection that it should write over the halls of legislation, "Whoever has influence here may have his share

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the legalized pillage." We may disavow his harsh epithets, and yet feel the truth of his statement and note its confirmation in our own experience. Democracy does not believe that this is a legitimate function of government, and stands pledged to change it. If it fails, its pathway lies over broken promises and forgotten principles, and, abandoned by a betrayed people, it will meet and deserve defeat. But our critic says, "There is widespread distress even under present high protection; the time is inopportune for withdrawing the prop of government from any industry." Yes, and equally inopportune for placing or retaining any unnecessary burden on the people. If he means that the Democratic party is responsible for the hard times, or that they will be relieved by continuance of the tariff policy under which they have arisen, he reopens the whole tariff question, which the Democratic party is ready and glad to re-argue before the people. But into that controversy it is not my purpose now to enter. For I assume that, whatever the merits of the question, the measure of success of a party in power is not the abandonment of its principles, nor is its best claim for the continued support of the people its refusal to carry out their will. Rather, I insist, the test of success is fidelity to principle, the courageous discharge of a plain duty, and obedience to the people's mandate. Such course can be trusted to bring its own reward: any other is retreat, defeat, suicide.

Tested and measured by this standard, the Democratic administration thus far has been faithful and successful. In its proposed tariff legislation it may not meet the extreme wishes of many within its ranks; it may not follow strictly its own principles to their full and legitimate conclusions. The bill is not radical, nor wholly logical. But it is dealing with a policy which for thirty years has ruled the country, and has encouraged many men and interests to believe that they were dependent upon it. This must be considered in practical legislation, and time allowed to meet the changed conditions. The fundamental fact is that the Wilson bill changes an established policy. Henceforth high protection is to cease, McKinleyism is to be repealed and ended, and the country gradually is to be brought back to the principle of tariff taxation for revenue only, both as a sound economic policy and as a sound limitation on a great power of government. If this is the main purpose and result of the measure, it is comparatively unimportant that its details may be open to objection and criticism. If protectionists declare it destructive, and radical reformers declare it too conservative, their conflicting criticism is proof of its purpose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to change a fundamental policy, but upon a safe and prudent basis. But our critic says: "Since the election of 1892 other matters of pressing importance have arisen, whose treatment by the Democratic party enters into the question of its success." This is true: but it has not lessened the obligation of the party to be faithful to its main duty; it has only added to it other and new responsibilities. Chief of these, no doubt, is to remedy, so far as possible, the financial panic and consequent distress through which we are passing. Whatever the cause of this our portion of a world-wide suffering, whether due to conditions as universal, or in whole or in part to past improvident and unsound legislation peculiarly our own, the existence of the evil certainly placed a duty upon the party in power. But the nature and extent of this duty necessarily depend upon the cause of the evil and the power of the party to remedy it. If the cause were, as many believe, financial and other troubles outside our country, which, starting in the Argentine Republic, Australia, England, and India, became world-wide in their destructive sweep, both cause and remedy were beyond the reach of political action here. If the cause were the extravagance and waste of a past administration, time, economy, and reform alone can cure the evil; and the Democratic party has fully done its duty in the defeat of that administration and the correction of its abuses. Such acts as curtailing the expenses of the Departments, revising and purging the pension-rolls, reducing largely the appropriations, all are to this end, and mark a Democratic policy of economy and retrenchment beneficial and necessary. If the cause of our distress is legislation past or prospective, then our inquiry is, what legislation, and what was or is the remedy. The only legislation suggested as touching this matter is upon silver and the tariff.

When the Democratic party came into power in March, 1893, business was prosperous and so continued for months. The Democratic tariff policy had been known for years. It had been declared in platforms, formulated in bills, and was the commanding issue in five successive campaigns. Upon that single issue the party carried the country four months before its accession to power; and two years before that this policy had been overwhelmingly indorsed by the people. There has never been a day since November, 1890, when there was the least doubt as to the general position and action of the party upon the question, and business interests could and did govern themselves accordingly. But during this time there was a growing mistrust of our financial legislation, especially of the Sherman Act

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 1890, and a constantly increasing conviction that it was breeding evils out of which must come a crisis and distress. Our hoard of useless silver was increasing, our gold-reserve diminishing, expenditures were exceeding revenue, all controlled by Republican laws then in force. The administration of President Harrison, in its closing days, saw the crisis coming, and planned extraordinary measures for temporary relief; then tided things along, and passed this trouble over with many others unsettled as a legacy to its successor. Confidence was impaired, credit shaken, and the crisis came. There were uppermost then in the public mind both the silver and tariff questions; yet, by a general consensus of the conservative sentiment of the country, and the practically unanimous opinion of business interests, silver and the Sherman law were declared to be, of legislative measures, the sole cause of the trouble, and urgent demand was made for the repeal of that law. Here was an evident duty resting upon the Democratic party. For its discharge, fortunately, it had but to be true to its own past action and professions. It had unanimously opposed the passage of the law; it had bitterly denounced it in its National Convention; it had nominated and elected as its President one known to be unalterably opposed to that and all similar legislation. Under his steadfast leadership, in extraordinary session of Congress, conquering opposition within its ranks, it grappled with the question, repealed the law, and placed the country, so far as in its power lay, upon a sound financial basis. It applied the one remedy demanded and was true to itself and the country. It stopped the financial panic, but its evil and distress were beyond the reach of legislation.

While I insist that the proposed reduction of the tariff is not the cause of present distress, and has never been so considered outside the lines of narrow partisanship, it is no doubt true that any proposed general change in the tariff, whether to raise or to lower it, temporarily creates uncertainty and disturbs business. To remove this uncertainty it is a duty to enact the measure as speedily as is consistent with its proper consideration, and to make it as permanent as practicable. The country demands an immediate settlement of the question, and will not tolerate delay and obstruction. When settled, it asks that for a while at least it so remain; whatever the objection to details, the future will show, I believe, a general acquiescence in the measure rather than an immediate reopening of the question and renewed agitation. To these demands the Democratic party has given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heed. It has done its duty with reasonable dispatch. It rests now with the Opposition to say whether it will make of consideration, delay; and of discussion, obstruction. The Democratic party has framed its bill upon the just principle and broad basis of free raw material. If it strenuously adheres to this principle, as consistency and its own interest demand, this measure will be lasting.

One further important duty rested upon the Democratic party in power. The country for years had considered the question of National control of elections. Upon this question the parties were at issue. On the one side it was urged that further stringent legislation by Congress was wise and necessary to give efficient National control of elections in the States; on the other, that existing legislation should be repealed, that the States might have the right unquestioned of controlling their own elections, and the responsibility undivided of correcting any abuses. It was perfectly understood that the Davenport-Lodge bill was inspired by hostility to the South, and a determination, through Republican machinery, to gain a partisan advantage. The country repudiated the motive, purpose, and principle of the bill; it had grown heartily sick of the "bloody shirt" and sectional prejudice and hostility; it believed and said that the South had a right to be let alone, and every State the right to be free from such National interference. It directed the Democratic party to repeal the Federal Election Law, because it was a menace, creating sectional ill-will, breeding evils and curing none; and the party has speedily and gladly done this duty.

Another matter has attracted the attention of the country,—the Hawaiian controversy. It is not necessary here to discuss in detail the mass of contradictory evidence. Two facts have impressed themselves upon the people: first, that we have been saved from a hasty, ill-considered attempt to annex these Islands; and, second, that the President, with courage and truest patriotism, made National honor and justice alone determine our action and relation to this weaker power. The honorable precedent thus established of substituting justice for expediency or conquest in international action will be proudly remembered long after petty criticism of its details has been forgotten.

To recapitulate: *A year of Democratic administration can show as a worthy record:—*

1. Loyalty to its main duty of repealing McKinleyism, reversing the tariff policy of the country, and making public—not private—interests its fundamental principle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. Placing the currency of the country upon a sound basis by the repeal of dangerous Republican legislation.

3. Repeal of the Federal Election Law, and so reuniting the country more closely in love and loyalty.

4. Economy, retrenchment, and reform in appropriations, expenditure, and the administration of all departments.

These things it has done, not only in adherence to its principles, but also in obedience to the explicit mandate of the country.

Last, and perhaps not least,—honorable conduct of our foreign relations, with justice to a small and weaker power.

The Democratic party in the past has achieved success only by courageous loyalty to principle; it never has succeeded by substituting tactics for statesmanship, or compromise for courage, and it never will. If now, in the high tide of its power, it should fritter away its opportunity in quarrels over petty things, forgetting the larger; if, in the face of its united, aggressive enemy, it should become rent by factional or sectional discord; if it should neglect the demands of the people who have trusted it, or the manifest duty they have placed upon it,—there will be ample leisure in the future for it to ponder on its fatal blunders and wasted opportunity. We cannot and must not overlook this danger. Personal politics, local interests, and sectional influences, which create discord and impair efficiency, must yield to a higher view of party duty and responsibility.

The masses of the party have united upon a great principle; won to its support the conscience and patriotism of the country; fought for it through defeat to victory; and are now demanding that their Gettysburg shall bring, not surrender, but the promised Emancipation Proclamation. They will not tolerate partisan or factional opposition; they will never forget any betrayal of their cause by their chosen representatives. So more vigorously than ever they are summoning their leaders to march on, and more loyally than ever will follow resolute leadership. Only thus can their victory bring its promised fruits, and triumphant Democracy achieve permanent success.

WM. E. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A YEAR OF DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION.

It is customary in the business world for a merchant to take an annual inventory showing the condition of his business at the close of the year, and to strike a balance showing the profit or loss for the period. The Democratic party took charge of the books, the treasury, and the business of the United States, March 4, 1893, and the time has arrived for taking an account of stock and striking a balance for the year just passed.

As an observer who has a certain interest in the national welfare, although not a large stockholder in the present administration, I have found my curiosity gratified in challenging my imagination to discern what sort of inventory the Democratic party would make—if it were to make any—for the first year devoted to unrestricted reform. I have therefore gone back for a twelvemonth and a day, and recall a few things which seem to be properly classified as part of the stock in trade with which the party in power commenced business one year ago.

In March, 1893, President Cleveland received from President Harrison a solvent treasury, a prosperous country, and the control of the interests of a happy, thriving people. The only shadow upon the horizon at that time was the intangible but universal fear of the people that the Democratic party, with uncontrolled power in the political branches of the government, would bear out its proverbial reputation for doing exactly the wrong thing. The presence of this shadow was felt and expressed by very many members of that party itself, who doubted the wisdom of their party leaders. The entire country had cheerfully and patriotically concurred in the wisdom and Americanism of the foreign policy of the retiring administration, and from Cape Cod to the Seal Islands not a dissentient syllable was heard in regard to the cherished proposition of President Harrison's administration peacefully to extend the sovereignty and jurisdiction of this Republic over the waiting population of the beautiful islands of the western sea. The surviving and dependent participants in the great and fearful war had long received at the hands of the govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment such aid and bounty as a course of generous legislation had appropriated for their welfare. They felt that a rescued Republic had recognized the salvation which their palsied arms had wrought out upon bloody fields, and they were satisfied and thankful. The revenues of the United States were substantially equivalent to the current necessities of the government, and sufficient for the welfare of the growing nation, while the extinguishment of the public debt was progressing with due rapidity. Salutary federal laws for the security and protection of the elective franchise from fraud and crime, and a system of supervision of elections in localities where rascality and intimidation were dominant, had been operative for many years.

Having thus briefly shown the situation at the beginning of the Presidential term, let us turn the page and see the situation to-day.

In March, 1894, the Treasury is so nearly insolvent that an issue of $50,000,000 in bonds has been made, with a probable deficiency of $72,000,000 during the current fiscal year. Every industry throughout the land is stagnant or dead. The shadow of last year became a cloud, and the cloud has been followed by a cyclone of ill-fortune from which there appears to be no present relief. Let me classify approximately the penalties which have followed as the early result of the political tornado of November, 1892. Far below the very lowest intelligent estimates made from statistics of value, I may charge the dominant party with having caused an absolute and tangible loss in dollars and cents to the Saturday-night recipients of weekly wages, the working men and women of the United States, of $500,000,000. I mean by this that by the depression in business consequent upon the advent to power of a political party which is not responsible to any higher authority,—hardly even to public sentiment,—more than half a billion dollars in wages have been taken from the year's due of men, women, and children who stood ready and anxious to give a good dollar's worth of labor for every dollar of wages. To the farmer of the United States, the loss in value of products caused by the certainty of the impending improvident and reckless legislation which is now in progress, added to the loss by reduction of the value of farm lands, make an aggregate sum which will appal the statistician who investigates the subject. A thousand millions of dollars is but a small and modest estimate of the difference between the value of farms and farm products in March, 1893, and March, 1894. This is the penalty which the laborers and the farmers of the United States have paid in one year for the privilege

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of listening to the eloquent speeches of Senator Roger Q. Mills, Mr. William L. Wilson, and others, and for following the supreme fallacies of the Chicago platform of 1892, that protection is a fraud and a robbery, and that "the Federal government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only."

But the story is not yet half told. Our interests are so interdependent, every avocation has such a close relation to some other, that the blow which prostrates one industry injures or perhaps ruins several others. The knife which draws the blood from the heart of labor wounds and cripples capital. The disease which lays low the farmer breeds a contagion which is not confined to the agricultural districts; nor is it restrained, for it sweeps the continent and searches out all industries. Nobody escapes. Corporate enterprises, manufactories, railways, tradesmen, professions,—every interest is reached, and all the people wear ashes. These various interests, corporate and individual, in which capital has been so largely invested, including every factory, mill, store, shop, railroad, mining company, vessel-owner, and transportation company, have sunk, in valuation of investment and in loss upon business, much more than $1,000,000,000 in addition. From north to south the smokeless chimneys are monuments of the spread of the pestilence: here the powerless water-wheel and the silent mill; yonder the bankrupt store; ships rotting at the wharves; and on every hand the idle laboring man. Add together, then, the recorded results of wrecked industry and stagnant business which have met our eyes and ears; give ample allowance for every hope and ray of future sunshine; and upon the most undoubted proof we find our country more than $2,500,000,000 to the bad in twelve months.

In making these estimates I have accepted the statistics in part of qualified persons, and, finding that a close adherence to figures which seem to be approximately correct would furnish results so vast, I have greatly reduced them, so as simply to present to view a pertinent object-lesson. As a sample of some of the modes of computation, take the five States of New York, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Iowa.

In 1890 there were 124,668,158 acres of farm land in these five States, the value of which, including all farm buildings, fences, and improvements, was $5,057,557,375, making an average per acre of $40.57. This value remained nearly the same until the spring of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1893, since which time the depreciation has been marked and rapid. It is the opinion of many people that $10 per acre will not cover the actual loss in value of farm property. I have, however, for the purpose of this discussion, rated it at only about $4 per acre, which shows $498,672,732, or about half a billion dollars for these five States. Reducing this still further, extending it over the farm lands of the entire country, and adding to it the loss upon farm products, the result will still exceed the aggregate in the inventory made above.

The withdrawal, by the President, of the Hawaiian treaty pending in the Senate at the time of the inauguration, not only put a stop to all action looking to closer relations with Hawaii, but the unauthorized sending of a special subordinate to Honolulu, with hidden orders and private instructions, startled the people of this country. It was a revelation to them that an American President intended to do what no other civilized Executive has ever dared to attempt, and what no President of the United States will ever try again,—to deceive the head of the recognized government of a friendly nation, and lull him into quiescence until an abdicated monarchy could be stimulated into life sufficiently to overthrow that government. This astonishing experiment in modern diplomacy was doubtless intended to be the master-stroke of public policy of the President's second term, aided and assisted by the Secretary of State. Whatever it was intended to be, however, does not interest us so much as what it proved to be. And it proved to be the stupendous blunder of the century—the mark for the ridicule of the world, which must rest against the good name of this Republic until it shall be expunged and expiated by an era of good government at some future period.

The status of the case to-day is this: The administration stands condemned by the people; it concedes by Presidential message that its policy is a total failure; and, after discovering that the Executive is not the only branch of this government, the President abandons the scheme and asks Congress to condone the wrong he has brought upon the country.

The pensioned soldiers and sailors of the United States have acquired twelve months of an experience which would have been pronounced impossible twenty years ago. It has proved to be an experience the history of which can never be heard from the closed lips of the many Union soldiers who died strangers to the solace which was their due, but of which they were deprived to satisfy a depart-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment-made law. Nothing was presumed favorable to the beneficiary. Upon him was made to rest the burden of making proof, where in innumerable instances his witnesses were dead or in unknown lands. This government never intended that its bounty to the nation's defenders should be hampered by conditions of technical and burdensome detail. When General Grant paroled General Lee's army after the surrender, he told those weary soldiers to take their horses and go home and use them in making a crop, in raising food for their families. This government did not court-martial General Grant for that act of humanity, nor censure him for distributing government bounty gratuitously to needy and suffering men. They were no longer enemies, but needy citizens who more than ever before were in need of the kindness of this government. No Northern man has ever questioned the right of that act of the successful general. How, then, shall we justify that policy which treats our own dependent soldiers with delay and obstruction in the distribution of the pension fund? Shall we do injustice and haggle about the method?—suspend the payment and let the soldier die? Shall a great government withhold the means of life of a million people, while it stops to prosecute a hundred or two thieves and scoundrels? Let such a policy die, and let the soldier live out his days.

The situation to-day is, that practically all of the surviving soldiers of the late war, together with the great majority of the people of both political parties, condemn the pension policy of this administration in not executing the behests of the law in good faith, and in failing to do substantial justice to the beneficiaries.

The revenues of the government fall largely short of the current expenses, and fail to furnish the necessary amounts for the payment of the general appropriations, while the gradual payment of the public debt appears to be postponed until such times as the Republican party shall again take control.

Under a pretended purpose "to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the government, and for other purposes," the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has passed a tariff bill, and the Democrats in the Senate have, after many secret sessions and solemn caucuses, agreed upon the bill with many amendments, and have reported it as amended to the Senate, where it is now under discussion. It is a hybrid measure, with mild protection for a few special articles where Democratic votes are needed to secure the passage of the bill.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Republican party believes in an American policy. Mr. Webster said in the Senate, many years ago, that the truest American policy was that policy "which shall most uniformly employ American capital and American labor, and best sustain the whole population." That great statesman said further:

"With me it is a fundamental axiom,—it is interwoven with all my opinions,—that the great interests of the country are inseparable; that agriculture, commerce, and manufactures will prosper together or languish together."

How true this statement is, and what a demonstration we have had of it during the last two years! During this brief period we have seen commerce, manufactures, and agriculture prosper, with no man idle who desired to work; followed by stagnation in business, the wheels of commerce still, agriculture terribly depressed, mills, factories, and mines closed, with men in enforced idleness on every street!

The Republican party has always been steadfast in its devotion to American interests, to American labor, to the policy of building up and making independent our own nation. The Democratic party has sometimes opposed, sometimes embraced, and sometimes coquetted with the great principle underlying the protective tariff system. What is that principle? It is loyalty to American enterprise and labor—loyalty to the manhood of American citizenship.

The Democratic platform of 1876 said:

"We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue."

Again, the National platform of that party in 1892 declared—

—"that the Federal government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only."

These declarations are plain and easily understood, and have for years been in harmony with the known views of the majority of the party, but are not in harmony with declarations made by the party in national convention in 1868, 1872, 1884, and 1888. In the national platform of 1868 the party pronounced in favor of—

—"a tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under the internal revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufacturers, and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon, and best promote and encourage, the great industrial interests of the country."

The platform of 1872 said:

"Recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These utterances were clearly in the nature of coquetting with the tariff question. But in 1884 and in 1888 the Democratic National Conventions pronounced in favor of tariff revision—

—"without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country."

With such a record, when the Democratic party found itself in power in the legislative and executive departments of the government, and charged with the responsibility of national affairs, no wonder that the administration and Congress have made an exhibition of weakness and confusion exceedingly discreditable, if not disgraceful.

Another thought or two upon the question of the tariff: The Republican and Democratic parties are wide apart as the poles on the tariff question. The Democratic platform declares "that the Federal government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only." This means that a tariff law so framed as to give protection to American industries would be unconstitutional. The Republican party favors a tariff act not only to raise revenue for the support of the government, but to give protection to American industry and American labor at the same time. The policy of the Republican party is the policy of the fathers. The preamble to the first tariff act passed after the adoption of the Constitution read as follows:

"Whereas it is necessary for the support of the government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported."

This act was passed in 1789, and was approved by George Washington on the 4th of July of that year. Yet the Democratic party in these latter days declares against the constitutionality of a protective tariff law. The fathers knew what the Constitution meant, for they made it. Washington approved the act, the preamble of which declared one of the reasons for the act to be the encouragement and protection of manufactures.

We have absolute free trade in this country—free trade between communities, municipalities, counties, States. The internal commerce of the nation is all free. We pay our own taxes. Each municipality, county, State, and the nation separately pays its own expenses. What does all this amount to? Multiplied millions every year! The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people have levelled the hills, developed the mines, built their railroads and great cities, surveyed more than twenty thousand miles of sea-coast, built their wharves, landings, seaports, canals, and bridges, —all these things are but a few of the great works in the construction of which the American people have shared, and which make us an independent nation. Why should we not have free trade among ourselves, and why should any foreign nation have free trade with us? The people of the United States fought for and established their independence and paid the expense. They maintained the integrity of the Union, developed the nation's resources, and secured superior social and political conditions and paid the cost. No foreign nation did it. Why should any foreign peoples have the benefit of our markets free?

At this time, owing to the persistence of the Democratic majority in Congress, the laws for the protection of the ballot, above referred to, have been repealed, and now the elections for Representatives in Congress are provided with no federal safeguards, but rest entirely upon the enforcement of State laws. The recent election-fraud history in New York and New Jersey, and the emphatic expressions at the polls in those States and in Pennsylvania, furnish an idea of what the people at large believe regarding the policy of the party in power. It is unnecessary to extend remarks upon this subject.

In conclusion, if there is any one thing in the status of the Democratic party in March, 1894, upon which that organization may congratulate itself, it is only the fact that it has three years of federal power still before it.

If there is any one thing upon which this country may congratulate itself, it is the fact that whenever and wherever public opinion finds expression, it sets the seal of emphatic disapprobation upon the entire work of the Democratic party during its first year of control. No historian will volunteer as the apologist of that party for its year's work of destruction and retrogression.

The year has witnessed, instead of progress, advancement, and reform, a "falling back," a return to antiquated and obsolete ideas and methods, justified by no necessity. Wherever any vigorous advance has been made, it has invariably been in a wrong direction, —a step which must be some time retraced. But 'tis said,

"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

S. M. Cullom.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NECESSITY OF STATE AID TO THE UNEMPLOYED.

THERE is only one good method of relieving the distress of the able-bodied working people whom the collapse of industry has now for nine long months made familiar with starvation. That method is to give them wages in return for useful work.

Those persons have but a theoretical knowledge of the lives of the working classes, who imagine that the evils of this winter have been averted if the people have had sufficient food, clothing, and shelter. The worst calamity of all is, of course, to be both idle and hungry, for hunger undermines and destroys the will-power and intelligence of a man more rapidly than support by charity; so that men are wrong to prefer starvation, as they do, to begging. And yet we must not forget that to feed the able-bodied and clothe them still allows the next to the worst of all calamities to fall upon them and crush out their manhood. The moment idleness, though at first enforced, becomes by habit agreeable, that moment a deterioration—a decay—of the man's character sets in at the very root. During the first six weeks of unavoidable idleness the man rises at five in the morning, searches the advertisements in the newspapers for situations, and calls at one factory after another through the day. The second six weeks, finding that the search for work is vain, he has given it up, but is restless and troubled. The third six weeks, if hunger has not already driven him to crime and beggary, he at least has begun to wonder how he ever cared for work at all. The steps from the enforced idleness down into loaferdom, drunkenness, vagrancy, and crime, are short and near together; and while the bounteous relief this winter, in food, clothes, and coal, may have diverted thousands from the gateway of the prison, it has only been to lead them straight to the door of the almshouse. It is evident, therefore, that there is only one wise method of bringing relief to the able-bodied unemployed,—giving wages in return for work. There should have been no more food, clothing, and coal distributed among the poor this last winter than in ordinary years. For it is an axiom of charity that such relief should be administered only to incapables in mind or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

body, the aged, invalids, and little children. But there have been no more incapables than usual. The muscles of the men have not lost their strength, nor the fingers their skill, nor the brain and eye the power to direct the hand. All that has been needed or been wanted (except now so far as false charity has corrupted character) has been compensation for toil useful to the community.

But we must hasten to admit that private employers have neither work nor wages to offer; if they had, we should not be confronted with the problem of the unemployed. It has therefore been a vain plea to urge employers to retain their workmen and to continue to manufacture articles even if the immediate market did not require them. Not one employer in a thousand could be foolhardy enough thus to court bankruptcy. But the only other kind of employment that could be offered by private enterprise would be distinctively relief-work, conducted by philanthropic committees, and supported by private donations. Yet such efforts must be totally inadequate. It would have taken millions of dollars to find work for half of the unemployed of New York city this winter. The chief benefit of the relief-work done under the Citizens' Committee, if the community were only prone to learn lessons from experience, would be the moral that private philanthropy cannot provide work in any degree proportionate to the demand, any more than private employers can. It has been heart-rending to have to turn ninety-nine men away for every one man to whom we could give relief-work, yet this was the ratio at which employment was found for the idle by the New York Relief Committees. And even if relief-work committees provided adequate work, it would really be only almsgiving disguised, for after street-sweeping and a few other occupations were well staffed, they would have to open shops and manufacture commodities for which they could find no market. What, then, is to be done?

It happens that there is in each city in the United States one employer who is rich enough to pay the wages, and who has enterprises enough that should have been started long ago, to provide work for all the unemployed until trade revives. This employer is in each case the municipality itself. Here, then, is the solution of our problem!

And yet most persons reject with consternation the proposal that the city should set the unemployed to work. They have often heard of this trick of calling in state aid as a *deus ex machina*. But is it possible, they ask, that there are still educated men to be found who have not read their Herbert Spencer on "Man versus the State," or who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have so sunk into demagogy as to impose once more this baneful fallacy upon the ignorant poor? Surely, those who advocate State work for the unemployed must know that it would be but one more attempt on the part of the poor to lift themselves by their boot-straps out of the slough of hard times by taxing poverty to pay for employing the poor. Or, if not that, at least they must know that it is the entering wedge of socialism,—the beginning of the downfall of our middle-class republic. Men who advocate this method and agency for relieving the unemployed, it is declared, have an ulterior object, remote from helping the hungry; they wish somehow to bring industries under government control, so that it will be easy to seize them. Or, if it be granted that municipal works for the unemployed, under the present industrial conditions, would not necessarily be a socialist policy, nor the economic blunder of trying to create something out of nothing, still, it is urged, no judicious, honest man, but only a wild dreamer, would—at least in New York city—put into the hands of the present corrupt government the opportunity of feeding 80,000 starving families. Why, out of gratitude toward the corrupt machine, the poor would allow its leaders to fasten it as a millstone about their necks forever! But more; the city authorities would not leave their fate to gratitude. For each mess of pottage in the shape of wages on expedited works, each man would have to contract to sell his birthright of a free vote to the "labor expert." After that, we could not possibly eject Tammany next autumn! We are forced to choose the lesser of two evils and let the people starve.

Of course those who offer these objections do not mind a little patching up of a few defective sidewalks, or the hiring of an extra staff of men to cart away the snow, to re-asphalt a few streets, or to begin a sewer that was to be started next week in any case. The consternation seizes them only at the thought of making the public works adequate to the widespread need. This thought has found so few champions that in New York, for example, not one of the great daily papers has advocated it. And the first committee appointed by President Low to wait upon the Mayor to inquire whether the city would do anything, after calling once and being received politely, was dissolved. Of the few magazine articles on the unemployed which have appeared this winter in the United States, the most have only recorded the facts as to what has been done to relieve distress. The article by Dr. Lyman Abbott does not pretend to grapple scientifically with the problem, and, consistently with this spirit of hu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mility, teaches that unwise sympathy is better than unsympathetic wisdom. Mr. Henry George has of course no other suggestion to make than the single tax. Happily one finds in Mrs. Lowell's article, in a foot-note, this clear recognition of the one wise method and the one adequate agency:

"Municipalities, although not justified in spending money raised by taxation in any unnecessary works, or for the benefit of individuals, may well take into consideration the actual condition, and 'expedite works' (to use the English official phrase) which are necessary and which have been decided on for the benefit of the community."

But while few voices have been heard in favor of adequate municipal works, and while Mrs. Lowell gives her important sanction only in a foot-note, yet nobody has for a moment pretended that any other agency than the city itself, or any other method than wages for work, is competent to the task. They have simply admitted the problem as one for which humanity and justice demanded a solution, and then have left it to time and chance.

Now it is possible that a careful analysis of the whole situation, a conscientious consideration of the present industrial emergency, and of the lack of public comforts and even necessities of health and decency in American cities, may lead at least working-men voters, and those who sympathize with the people, to demand public works immediately upon a magnificent scale, in spite of Mr. Herbert Spencer, the boot-strap joke, and Tammany! There is only one class of the community whom there is no hope of convincing. They are the social dogmatists, who love their theory better than they love human beings, who illustrate the truth of George Eliot's statement that "there is no general doctrine which is not capable of eating out our morality, if unchecked by the deep-seated habit of direct fellow-feeling with individual fellow-men." Let me now present the case to my *human* readers.

Happily there is a striking historical precedent—that most powerful instrument for penetrating through to the very brain of unimaginative people—in favor of local works in aid of the unemployed. The analogy between our present industrial crisis and the great Lancashire cotton-famine of 1861 to 1865 is so close as to make comparisons and inferences scientific. It was an unusual, unexpected, sudden calamity, not to be repeated in many years, which threw several hundred thousand cotton spinners and weavers and their dependents in Lancashire out of employment, when Abraham Lincoln

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

declared our Southern ports under strict blockade, and England proclaimed neutrality toward the belligerents. Now, whatever the cause or causes, our industrial system was shattered last summer as unexpectedly as if we had been struck by a thunderbolt out of a clear sky. Possibly only socialists believe that the prostration of trade is due to permanent forces inherent in the very nature of our industrial system, and that the men now thrown out of work are a part of the regular army of the unemployed. It is most important that the temporary, and, as it were, accidental, character of the present difficulty should be clearly recognized. For, undoubtedly, public works by cities are no cure for the chronic lack of employment. Only on the ground that the malady is acute, unusual, and not to recur in many years, could any one seriously advocate public works as a remedy. Is it believed that trade is never going to revive, never going to draw back into its ranks the extra number of men who in previous winters have had employment, and now perhaps for the first time are forced into idleness? If, on the contrary, trade is expected to pick up in a year or so, then the present emergency must be classed with the Lancashire cotton-famine, and we are constrained to infer that, except where the cases are different, the same results would follow or not follow here, which followed or did not follow there, upon the opening up of local public works for the unemployed. In the first place, it did not prove to be the entering wedge of socialism; or, in any case, the wedge stopped entering. No historian has risked his reputation by intimating that the action of Parliament and of local authorities on behalf of the sufferers from the cotton-famine is a cause of the increase of socialism. As soon as the cotton trade revived, the men went back to the mills. Indeed, Mr. Robert Rawlinson reported on the 12th of January, 1866, that during the last nine months of 1865 the progress of the public works in course of execution had been somewhat retarded, owing in part to a scarcity of skilled labor and the resumption of work in cotton mills.

Incidentally this historical precedent may be also cited against the argument that such work as public buildings, the construction of streets, parks, and sewers, demand, cannot be done by men accustomed only to indoor activities. The sixteenth annual Report of the Poor-Law Board gives Mr. Rawlinson's statement that this experiment in Lancashire ought to inculcate a lesson for future use, namely, that unskilled men may soon be taught the use of tools where practical means are found to furnish employment. He says that town

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sewers and land drains were executed, as respects trenching, timbering, and earthenware-pipe-laying, by men who had previously earned their living within the four walls of some cotton factory. He at another time tells of a case where an experienced guardian laid before his Board a complaint that the men at work near his residence were not factory operatives, but upon inquiry it was found that he had formed an erroneous conclusion from their healthy looking faces and from the skilful manner in which they wielded their implements. It would be a blessing in disguise, as regards their health and general ability, if all the tailors now idle in New York were constrained to work in the parks or even at street-sweeping for three months. Perhaps some of them already have discovered the indirect gains. The secretary of one tailors' trades union preferred for his men street-cleaning tickets to those admitting the bearer to the relief tailor-shops. But the chief lesson is that public improvements, although calling into action only a few industries, would secure employment for all classes of workers, except possibly women; and even they might better do the light out-of-door work,—work not too "heavy" for women, not heavier than scrubbing floors and washing clothes all day: that were better than to be fed in idleness by charity. But once having an historical precedent which proves beyond a doubt that factory hands can easily learn the work needed on public improvements, we have answered forever one of the most frequently heard objections to employment by the city,—the chief objection which the mayor of New York rhetorically urged when in January a committee of nineteen men, representing about eighty trades unions, called upon him on behalf of the unemployed.

But where would the money come from, to pay out,—for vividness' and largeness' sake let us say—ten million dollars in wages, in the city of New York alone, within the next six months? It is remarkable that this question should have ever been asked. One would have supposed that every one in America understood our system of taxation and of the issuing of bonds by cities. But stranger than the asking of the question is the answer given by some of the newspaper kings of New York city. They say that poverty would have to be taxed to provide such work for the poor. Is it possible that in our republic the incidence of taxation falls heaviest upon men in proportion as they are unable to pay? The cause of the French Revolution was that the poor paid all the taxes. I had been naïve enough to think that in New York city, if the city decided to begin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fifty million dollars' worth of improvements, so as to bring us up within sight of the level of Paris and Berlin in beauty and cleanliness and public comforts, the burden of the taxes would not fall at all upon the very poor. At any rate it is upon this belief that I base my argument for the expediting of municipal works in aid of the unemployed. But even if the poor had to pay the burden, it would not be so bad, if the payment were distributed over thirty years, as to starve outright now. And if the burden were to fall, proportionately to their ability, upon the rich, then the financial question is easily disposed of. The city has not yet reached its legal limit to the issuing of bonds by about fifty millions. The valuation of real property is $1,562,582,393, ten per cent of which amount is the legal limit to which bonds may be issued. The increase in the assessed value of real estate during each year is so great that there is practically no limit, either legally or as regards capacity, to the amount of works which the city might begin now.

The Report on the Cotton Famine Relief Works closes thus:

> "In due course of time the entire amount of borrowed capital will be returned into the national exchequer, leaving Lancashire richer by the full money value of all the works undertaken under the powers of the Public Works Act, 1863–64, and executed in the time of her deep distress."

But English local authorities, it will be said, are not "boodle" governments such as rob our cities. If our politics were pure, nothing would stand in the way between the people and the wages they need.

This sudden hunger and thirst after political righteousness, that demands it instantly, that would gladly pay the price of the extreme misery of hundreds of thousands of the innocent poor, rather than see it delayed a day beyond the next election, is prognostic of a near millennium. But even longings for political purity, if unchecked by the deep-seated habit of direct fellow-feeling with individual fellow-men, may eat out our morality. There come crises when we must use whatever instruments are at hand, however imperfect and rough. There is no time to sharpen our weapons just now. Even the "machine" could temporarily be made into an instrument of justice and mercy, if for once a human impulse should inspire the community. If the people are alert and vigilant there will be little thieving; and just as election frauds last November were detected and their perpetrators hunted down, so it would be easy for an alert and vigilant public to doom to utter death the party caught buying the votes of the unemployed. It made one think of the righteous wrath

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the prophets of Israel, to hear the rage of indignation which rose on all sides here in New York a few weeks ago because the Park Commissioners had offered one man, out of the million dollars available for the unemployed, a salary for thirty days at the rate of $5,000 a year. There is hope if we are awake. Do you not know that Tammany hears and fears? Why, so anxious is it to keep in power that we, the community, could mould it like wax and then fix it into the very shape and image of righteousness. It would prefer justice and purity to being cast out like rubbish to dishonor and oblivion.

But let our governments be no more honest and upright than usual, and still it were better that the people should find work. Better that only Tammany men should have a chance to earn a living than that all should be denied the opportunity. When the Republican and Democratic parties are morally, and from the point of view of the workingman's interest, as much alike as two peas in a pod, this virtue, that thinks it a menace to our noble republic because preference in giving work is shown to the starving poor of the other party, seems to be animated by the dog-in-the-manger principle.

It is, moreover, a fair question whether the way out of political corruption in America is not by the considerable increase of the responsibilities and functions of the municipal government. So long as politics is a mere by-play and episode in the lives and selfish interests of our citizens, it will be worth no one's time to purify it. On the other hand, if the city of New York should construct an underground railway, to be owned and operated by the people; should build the docks and wharves of granite and iron; should erect public baths and wash-houses and meeting halls for the people in every senatorial district; should build underground lavatories at every fourth street throughout the tenement-house quarters; and should tear down all the rear tenements, so as to provide more breathing space for the people,—if these responsibilities were placed upon our city government, our municipal parties would stand and fall, would go into and out of power, according to the strictness of their integrity. Those put the cart before the horse who think that the power must only follow the purity. Purity will and must follow power. The latter gives the community a motive for demanding the former.

Apart, however, from the question of political corruption or of relief work in aid of the unemployed, it is objected that in and of itself such a gigantic scheme of city improvements is socialistic. Of course if socialism means anything and everything, then these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public works are socialistic. But if it means—as it always does in the writings of Lassalle, Marx, Hyndman, William Morris, Sidney Webb, John Burns, and every other socialist the world over—the nationalization of land and of the instruments of production, then the building of public works for public health and convenience, no matter on how gigantic a scale, has not one trace of socialism in it. If every class of conveniences for the whole public were owned by the City, we should still be an infinite way from socialism. Whether it is an argument in favor of or against municipal works for the convenience of the people, that they are not socialistic, let each person decide for himself, but let the fact be clearly seen. Furthermore, a man may be a good socialist, and may be enthusiastic for these municipal improvements, and still honestly assert that this is not socialism. It is neither socialism nor anti-socialism; it is the neutral ground common to all classes of statesmen, who recognize that the good of the community is the end of the state. But people are confused; certain words like "socialism" and "anarchy" produce a temporary paralysis of the intellect, and an inhibition of the heart, accompanied by fear and trembling. A New Yorker, in discussing this scheme of public works,—a man educated and on other matters lucid, a successful business man,—was heard to declare recently that underground lavatories for the people meant anarchy. But this objection to public lavatories may in all kindness be passed over. It may, however, be stated for those whom the cry of socialism has troubled, that there are many underground lavatories in London owned by the municipality. There have also been public baths and laundries for many years, owned and operated by the vestry governments of the town, while the fame of the Embankment along the Thames is world-wide. And yet the Duke of Westminster draws his rent and the *bourgeoisie* is still triumphant.

There still remain for consideration many minor points of controversy, but they may be quickly disposed of.

If public works on a grand scale are started, how will the inrush of tramps and vagrants from the surrounding country be prevented? In the first place work does not draw chronic ne'er-do-weels; these prefer gifts to wages. Or at best it is only casual or half-week work that the loafer will tolerate. There is no reason why works such as I have been pleading for should not be conducted on exactly the same principles, with one exception, as if there were no problem of the unemployed. Let men be selected according to their merit as work-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men; let them work the regular eight hours a day and be paid at trades-union rates. But in order to keep the thrifty and skilful unemployed from coming from other places to the city, let the work be given only to residents of six months' sojourn.

It is sometimes thought that if the city once expedites works for the unemployed, then every winter there will be clamoring for public employment. But here we touch again upon that totally different problem of the chronic unemployed and how to deal with them. The unemployed who find occupation with private employers will not clamor for state aid. The regular seasonal lack of work is no dire calamity; presumably the wages during the busy time are enough to support the family until the slack period is over. The chronic victims of our so-called social progress must for the most part be treated as physical and moral wrecks; they must be given direct relief, or be held under restraint and forced to work.

If the regular army of the "out-of-works" is steadily growing, one remedy would be the stopping of all over-time work and a general reduction of the hours of labor, but this remedy is not pertinent to the present emergency. If the army again began to increase in numbers, still more radical changes would be required, but that time is further off.

There is, however, one other function which the city must perform in such a crisis as the present one, and which is equal in importance to the expediting of public works, if we are to rescue the thrifty working-people from demoralization at the hands of sentimental or self-interested almsgivers. There has been wholesale corruption of the character of the working-people this winter. There has been unlimited chance for fraud. And the waste from lack of co-operation among the distributing agencies has been incalculable. It is to be deeply deplored that for some reason or other the people who started the Charity Organization Society were tainted with *laissez-faire* doctrines and extreme individualistic theories. They did not see that the organization and unification of all relief agencies and methods cannot possibly be brought about by private efforts. The results of years of work by the Charity Organization Society may be swept away in one season of unusual distress by sentimentalists and by newspaper-advertising schemes for relieving the poor. Scientific philanthropists will some day learn that charity organization is a distinctive municipal function. Who but the city can prevent the dispensing of free bread, and can limit the relief of each agency to a given district, so that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there shall be no waste or overlapping? Who but the city can gather, week by week, full and accurate statistics of the condition of the unemployed? Who but the city can constrain each relief agency to send every day to a central office a full account of the work done? Who but the city can compel every agency to follow careful methods to avoid fraud? In short, the city should grant licenses to relief agencies and regulate their methods, under the same general power by which it licenses beer-saloons and pawn-shops, and for the same general reasons.

If free bread and clothes were to be distributed indiscriminately, in spite of municipal works on an adequate scale, honest workingmen would be tempted over from the ranks of labor into the mob of loafers. As it is for the preservation of the character of the workmen, as much as for the relief of their physical distress, that the works are expedited, the state in its municipal sovereignty must stop that random almsgiving which kills character more quickly than rum.

With the path to pauperization closed up at the one end, the state may open wide its avenues to labor at the other, being sure that, as soon as it is possible, private employers will begin to call off the men to this side and that. Indeed, the very opening of the public works would hasten the revival of trade. If ten million dollars in wages were in six months put into the pockets of the laborers of New York city, that of itself would almost end the local stagnation in the trade that has suffered most. The laborers and their families need clothes, and instantly the tailors now idle would be set to work in all the sweating-dens of the city. The petty retail dealers of all sorts of wares are on the verge of bankruptcy; they can sell on credit no longer. But what happened to the same class of sufferers as an indirect result of the public works started during the Lancashire cotton famine, would happen here: they would forthwith begin to receive cash from their customers, and would take back the assistants whom they had been forced to dismiss. It is safe to say that if, throughout the country, all the cities of 100,000 inhabitants should start only such public improvements as health, comfort, and education demand, it would shorten by many months the already terribly prolonged anxiety and distress under which the people still lie prostrate.

STANTON COIT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DANGEROUS ABSURDITY OF STATE AID.

I AM not sure that I fully understand the reasoning through which Dr. Coit arrives at his conclusions. That I may do him no injustice, therefore, it will be better for me to state his argument as I understand it; and then, as Aristotle says in telling one of his illustrative anecdotes, if it is not true of the person to whom it is attributed, it may very probably be true of some one else. For of course the convictions expressed in the article in question are important, not so much on account of the individual professing them, as because they are substantially the convictions of a great many people, which—so far as they are reasoned at all—must be derived from nearly the same premises. The main points of the argument appear to be as follows:

1. At the present time private employers of workmen cannot pay wages for work without wasting their capital. "Private employers have neither work nor wages to offer."

2. The same is true of such benevolent people as attempt to set up as employers. "Such efforts must be totally inadequate."

3. Every city can pay trade-union wages for work at the rate of eight hours a day without wasting capital. "There is in each city in the United States one employer who is rich enough to pay the wages." "Let men be selected according to their merit as workmen; let them work the regular eight hours a day and be paid at trade-union rates."

4. The very poor pay no municipal taxes. "In New York city, if the city decided to begin fifty million dollars' worth of improvements . . . the burden of the taxes would not fall at all upon the very poor."

5. Whoever is not very poor is rich, and there is no limit to the ability of the rich of New York to pay taxes. "The increase in the assessed value of real estate during each year is so great that there is practically no limit, either legally or as regards capacity, to the amount of works which the city might begin now."

6. Only city employees can successfully direct the work of relieving the destitute or furnishing work to the unemployed. The Charity Organization Society is "tainted with *laissez-faire* doctrines." "Charity organization is a distinctive municipal function."

So much for the statements of fact, or categorical propositions intended as economic arguments. By way of hypothetical and conjectural premises we have the following:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

7. If the hearts of the inhabitants of New York were to be converted, the conduct of its government would be changed. Tammany Hall would become "an instrument of justice and mercy," "the very shape and image of righteousness," "if for once a human impulse should inspire the community."

8. Increasing the sums available for expenditure by government employees tends to diminish waste and corruption. "Purity will and must follow power."

9. Such expenditures upon public works will not attract vagrants, or induce workmen to prefer public to private employment. "Work does not draw chronic ne'er-do-weels." "The unemployed who find occupation with private employers will not clamor for state aid."

10. Assuming that an able-bodied workman can find no work and has no property, it is morally better for him to become a beggar than to suffer hunger or to go to the poor-house.

11. It is still better, morally, for him to be supported by wages abstracted by taxation from the capital of those who cannot make a profit upon it if used in paying trade-union wages for trade-union work. These taxes are to be expended by government employees with even greater loss, in paying such wages for such work, and the objections of the owners of the capital are not to be regarded. "Conscientious consideration . . . may lead at least workingmen voters, and those who sympathize with the people, to demand public works immediately upon a magnificent scale." This argument carries with it the general conclusion that the city must employ the unemployed.

There is some attempt made to claim that the practical conclusion to be drawn from these premises is merely that quoted from Mrs. Lowell,—that it may be judicious for cities "to expedite works which are necessary, and which have been decided on for the benefit of the community." Provided these works are fairly put in the hands of contractors, to be carried out on business principles, the policy of expediting them admits of little question. But many passages in the article show that this is not the conclusion intended by the writer. Such measures would not accomplish his purpose. He evidently has in mind works that would not be commonly regarded as necessary, that have not been decided on, and that would cost much more than Mrs. Lowell contemplated. Hence it seems reasonable to examine the argument with reference to the conclusion which logically flows from it, rather than with reference to a conclusion which has no logical relation to the premises.

Upon examining these premises they appear to be far from self-evident or unquestionable; nor do I find anything in the shape of evidence—except in one instance—offered in their support. That exception is the case of public works in Lancashire during the cotton famine some thirty years ago. What is asserted of this case, however, is so vague as not to admit of definite expression; nor is it worth while to consider it critically, for the reason that no precedent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drawn from the conduct of industrial enterprises under an aristocratic government of a former generation is available now in determining the policy of an American city of large size governed by universal suffrage. The difference is vital; for, as is intimated, the voters in America may, upon conscientious consideration, take the whole matter of public works into their own hands, and throw all historical precedents—which, indeed, people who have imaginations may dispense with—to the winds. The experiment of public workshops in Paris in 1848 would be more analogous, and would be perhaps sufficient as an offset to the Lancashire experiment. But such comparisons are almost always misleading, owing to diversity of conditions; and, in order to make them available at all, an examination of details is required which is quite beyond the scope of a review article.

The evidence in conflict with these premises I will now state in a summary way.

1. Taking the country through, private employers have work to offer. It has been computed by the "Engineering and Mining Journal" that the consumption of coal during 1893 was actually nearly 2,000,000 tons more than in 1892. It is impossible to reconcile these figures with the theory that our industrial system has been "shattered." Consumption of coal means, upon the whole, production of goods, and that means work for producers. The railroad returns show that the distribution of goods also has suffered but a comparatively small decrease. More people than usual have been out of work; but this has been largely due to their refusal to accept reduced wages. There are abundant statistics showing that the volume of production has fallen off very little; although prices have been materially lowered. Individual experience is worthless against the regularly compiled returns of productive industries.

Taking the city of New York, it seems that lack of work has been complained of principally in the tailoring and building trades. As to the tailoring trade, it is notorious that within a few years many thousands of inferior human beings have been brought here, principally from eastern Europe, and dumped into this city and this industry. The "scale of living" to which these unfortunate persons have been habituated is such as to render it impossible for them to support themselves during even a brief cessation of work, and they have experienced in this country a repetition of the misery from which they suffered at home; although alleviated, probably, to a degree unequalled in their previous condition. Undoubtedly there is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an evil here; but it is not of a nature to demand the overthrow of our institutions as a remedy.

As to the building trades, the evidence requires fuller statement. Certainly there are thousands of laborers out of work in these trades. What is more, many of them will probably continue to be out of work for a good while yet. What is the cause of this? It is noteworthy that in the whole course of the argument under examination there is no reference to the causes of disorders for which the most violent remedies are recommended. This is in accordance with the reputed practice of those who profess to heal diseases by "Christian Science"; but it is as unscientific in the case of the body politic as in that of the human body. I cannot here undertake the omitted investigation, but I do not hesitate to assert that the principal cause is the action of the trade-unions. When a business depression comes on, employers must either contract their business or reduce their expenses. It is the policy of these unions to refuse to permit reductions of wages, and the cessation of employment necessarily follows. Let it be remembered that, when prices fall, a reduction in money wages to a corresponding degree is not a reduction in real wages. Hence to insist that the same money wages shall continue to be paid, when their purchasing power has increased, is to insist upon an advance of wages. A number of the builders of New York have made overtures to the unions, in the hope of resuming operations with a scale of wages which would make profits possible, or at least make the risk of loss not excessive. But the unions have ignored these propositions, and the time for planning buildings for the current year has passed away. The Park Commissioners are reported to have recently offered to pay the bricklayers $3.50 for eight hours' work, but the latter refuse to permit any one to work for less than $4.

The power of these unions in the city of New York is absolute. No architect will advise a client to resist them. No contractor can afford to quarrel with them. No workman outside of their ranks can find employment in the trades which they control. They will not permit their members to work except upon their own terms, and they will not permit independent workmen to work upon any terms. They are in close alliance with each other, and whatever demand is made by one union must be complied with, or all the others will stop work, no matter how many workmen are thrown out of employment, or how many families are impoverished. The building industry is so great in the city of New York, and the number of subsidiary trades

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so large, that its interruption in this way is almost enough by itself to account for the "collapse of industry."

Let no one mistake the spirit of these unions. It is their deliberate purpose to prevent any man from building a house in the city of New York, unless he employs in every detail of the work trade-union laborers and them only; unless he pays them such wages as they ask, for such an amount of work and of such quality as they choose to perform; and unless the materials used have been produced under the same conditions. Let them speak for themselves:

NEW YORK, March 4, 1894.

It having become apparent to the different trades connected with the Building Industry of New York that many of our wealthy residents have repeatedly awarded contracts to European firms, although the same interior decorative work can be made by our resident firms equally as well and as cheap, thus enforcing idleness upon many of our American Wood-Carvers, Modellers, Ornamental Plasterers, Marble-Cutters, Marble-Polishers, and other trades affiliated with the central organizations of New York; therefore, it was

Resolved, That the Central Labor Union, Board of Delegates, and the Building Trades' Section do condemn the un-American tactics of our extremely rich people, who ignore their fellow-countrymen, who were, undoubtedly, instrumental in enabling them to accumulate the wealth they now possess; and, furthermore, it was

Resolved, That all trades affiliated with the aforesaid bodies will, on and after June 1, 1894, refuse to handle any imported decorative or other building material, and will take any steps necessary to protect the industries affected by those methods.

Trusting this matter will be submitted to your clients for their consideration,

We remain, yours fraternally,

JACOB E. BAUSCH, *Secretary Board of Delegates.*
JOHN S. HENRY, *Secretary Central Labor Union.*
MERVYN PRATT, *Secretary Building Trades' Section.*

This circular had been preceded by one issued by the Ornamental Plasterers, complaining that they and their families had suffered by the unpatriotic and un-American conduct of "Messrs. C. Vanderbilt, E. T. Gerry (at present on the City Unemployed Committee), J. J. Astor, and members of the Metropolitan Club," in importing French work, "thereby depriving their fellow-citizens of employment." In order to "stop this evil," and because they "have helped to build up the great fortunes of those who now refuse to give them an opportunity to earn an honest living," they announce that they will handle no material not made in the city of New York.

These circulars are evidently issued after "conscientious consideration of the present industrial emergency." They show that great numbers of working-men voters think that they have a right to de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mand that accumulated wealth shall be employed in paying them wages on their own terms, and they have publicly announced that if the owners of this wealth will not so employ it, the city must. The college professors and economic theorists need not suppose that they are going to direct this experiment in municipal socialism. Like the Girondists, they will say their say, and then the authors of these circulars will take charge of the movement and conduct it in such a way as to secure to themselves what they call an honest living at the expense of those whose fortunes they claim to have made. Upon the whole the evidence justifies the conclusion that private employers have work to offer, and that a great part of the lack of employment in New York is due to the fact that certain workmen refuse to work unless their wages are practically raised at a time when profits are declining, while they, at the same time, prevent others from doing the work which they refuse.

2. If such of the unemployed as could get work would take it, or even allow others to do so, benevolent people "tainted with *laissez-faire* doctrines" would undertake to take care of the remainder. They have the disposition and they have the means to relieve the distress of those who are really unable to help themselves; but they feel under no obligation to maintain in idleness those who will neither work themselves nor let others.

3. No American city has any considerable riches except the riches of its inhabitants. The power of taxing gives it a first mortgage upon these riches, and this security gives it credit or power to borrow. But corporate enterprises are generally carried on at greater expense than private undertakings; and if citizens cannot pay trade-union wages and replace their capital, the loss to the city in attempting it would be still greater. "Public works on a magnificent scale," therefore, mean the compulsory waste of capital that would be productively employed under conditions of freedom.

4. The incidence of taxation is not scientifically determined by ascertaining what "naïve beliefs" exist upon the subject. Every man contributes to the payment of a tax whose income is in any way lessened by that tax, whether that income be from rent, interest, profits, or wages. Laborers in New York have to pay more or less rent, and, if taxes are increased, landlords endeavor to make their tenants pay the increase. If the increased taxes are spent in paying wages to men previously not getting any, they can afford to pay more rent, and, owing to the influx of laborers, they would have to do so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for a time. The laborers who did not get wages from the city would not be exempted on that account, and would have to pay the increased rate. Some part of the burden of the taxes, therefore, tends to fall upon the very poor.

5. Many people in New York are neither rich nor poor. Upon the average every piece of property in New York is mortgaged, and a very large number of the owners of property can do little more than meet their charges for repairs, interest, and taxes. Any increase of taxation may put it beyond the power of some of these owners to "make strap and buckle meet," and they will be deprived of their houses by foreclosure. A great many of the mortgages are held by savings banks and life-insurance companies, and represent the savings principally of the poor and of those in moderate circumstances. In bad times these institutions will have to bid in property which has become unproductive, and those whose money they have invested will have to bear the loss. Ample evidence exists in the history of this city to prove that the limits to the endurance of taxation are easily reached. It is enough to refer to the terrible savings-banks failures after 1873. The new building in this city is very largely done by builders of moderate capital, and between the walking-delegates and the tax-collector they are now in a critical condition. Of course there are many rich property-holders in New York who could bear heavier taxation, but the attempt to levy it would bring ruin upon many whose property is heavily mortgaged, and even upon some of those who hold the mortgages.

The evidence proving that taxation may easily pass the limits of endurance is overwhelming. Within an hour's ride from New York several towns can be reached that were bankrupted by undertaking "public works upon a magnificent scale." The number of Western communities that have been ruined from the same cause is countless. A very great number of people in the Eastern States, both poor and of the middle class, have been impoverished by the sudden check to the prosperity of these communities. Nor is any severer tax imposed upon any class than that which is paid by those who have only their wages to live upon, when they are deprived of these by the collapse of municipal credit and the consequent sudden stop to extravagant expenditure. The recent distress in this country was directly due to the meddling of government, and it was indirectly due to the abuse of the taxing power. The average cost of the pensions paid by the United States is $10 to $12 a year to every family in the country,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the total burden of taxation is probably $60 to $70. In many cases the pension charge alone is equal to half a month's or even to a month's wages. Not a few of the governments of the earth are now insolvent because of excessive expenditures upon public works. In South America and Australia, extravagant undertakings of this kind have caused widespread ruin and distress. They have had much to do with bringing their present misery upon the people of Italy, and the poor of several other nations are likely to find out, eventually, that the alleviation of temporary distress by governmental expenditure of capital is like keeping off the cold by burning down the house. The city of New York is exceptionally wealthy, and its inhabitants can bear heavy taxation; but to say that there is no limit to what they can pay is to ignore some of the most impressive lessons of human experience.

6. The proposition that the employees of our city government should take entire control of benevolent work is as preposterous as that for putting the walking-delegates in charge of public works. It is difficult to reconcile it with the requirement of "direct fellow-dealing with individual fellow-men." In view of the notorious condition of our public charities, and of the substantial and permanent work accomplished by private persons in systematizing private beneficence, it would be idle to discuss this point. Selfish and opinionated sentimentalists may do temporary mischief by obstructing and decrying this work, but such hindrances are exactly what the Charity Organization Society has always encountered and expects to encounter. It was called into being by those who had seen the wisdom of the apothegm, "It is the incapable enthusiasts that are dangerous."

7, 8. We cannot tell what the state of affairs would be were human nature other than it is. But the history of American municipal government shows that with increased population and expenditure there has come increased waste and corruption. As purity has shown no disposition to follow power in the past, it is unreasonable to suppose that it will and must follow it in the future. Let the socialists devote themselves to curing people of getting drunk and loafing and lying and cheating, and they will find that the world will get on so well that it will be hardly worth while to make it over. Although purity will not follow power, power does and will follow purity.

9. The assertion that workmen hired by private employers at wages of from one to two dollars a day would have no disposition to seek places under the government, where for fewer hours of work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they would get three or four dollars a day, does not need to be refuted by evidence. As to the restrictions which are suggested I will only quote the observation of Machiavelli: "Let no one who begins an innovation in a state expect that he shall stop it at his pleasure or regulate it according to his intention."

10. The able-bodied workman may be out of employment from several causes. His services may not be wanted because he is drunken, lazy, and incompetent, or because he steals, or because he spoils work, or because his word cannot be trusted. Or he may refuse to give his services upon such terms as employers can afford to pay. In such cases it cannot be assumed that it is morally better for the man to become a beggar than to suffer hunger. It is morally best for those who live upon wages to save a part of them against a rainy day, in which case they will not need to beg, to starve, or to demand public works, and it is not to be assumed that working-people are as a class improvident. The savings-banks deposits in this State amount to over $600,000,000, and the number of depositors is nearly 1,600,000,—a number considerably larger, probably, than that of all the families in the State. There are many other funds collected for the purpose of guarding against various emergencies. It is impossible to determine the proportion of working-people among these depositors, but it is well known to be very large.

11. Whether it is morally better or not to work for wages depends upon circumstances and upon conceptions of morality. If workmen enter into agreements with employers fairly and without compulsion, the presumption is that both are doing what is morally right. But if workmen, no matter how vicious and improvident, are to be paid wages from a subsidy which they vote themselves out of the savings of the provident, the latter will regard it as very far from morally better, and they will be justified in their view unless their rights depend entirely upon the will of the majority. The situation was foreseen by Aristotle, and his indignant question is still pertinent: "For what? if the poor, because they are the majority, may divide among themselves what belongs to the rich, is not this unjust? By Zeus! it will be judged just enough by the multitude when they gain the supreme power."

I should like, in conclusion, to make one point perfectly clear. In the article under examination, and in writings of like character, a certain assumption of superior righteousness is to be observed. Those whose minds are so constituted as not to assent to theories based

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon exploded fallacies and maintained in disregard of experience, appear to be looked upon as somehow morally delinquent. To defend the institution of property and the right to labor is, according to the socialists, a hard-hearted and cold-blooded proceeding. They regard the maintenance of the rights of individuals with the same contempt as is felt by the free-lovers for those dull and sluggish persons who insist upon curbing passion with the restraints of monogamy. But let it be distinctly understood that those whose convictions I have here ventured to set forth admit no monopoly of virtue by the socialists. We are quite as deeply, quite as earnestly, quite as conscientiously interested in the future welfare of society as they are. In behalf not so much of the rich as of the poor, in the interests not so much of ourselves as of our children and of our children's children, we propose to guard the precious heritage of liberty won for us by the agony of countless generations of our ancestors. For the love of God and for the love of man we shall defend it with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind, and with all our strength. No imputations of selfish and sordid indifference to the misery of the poor will induce us to consent to the repetition of social experiments that have caused ruin in the past, and that will, as reason satisfies us, produce the same result in the future. We may be for a time overborne; but the principles for which we contend will eventually prevail, or mankind will lie prostrate under despotisms which they have ceased to have the virtue to resist.

D. McG. MEANS.

On the subject of State Aid to the Unemployed the reader may profitably consult the chapters upon Government in Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations;" Aristotle's chapters on Democracy in his "Politics;" De Tocqueville's "Democracy in America;" Sir James Stephen's "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity;" J. S. Mill's "Socialism;" John Rae's "Contemporary Socialism;" and P. Leroy-Beaulieu's "The Modern State."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNIVERSITIES AND THE TRAINING OF PROFESSORS.

THE upward movement in higher education in this country, described in the former article, is still more marked abroad. The war of 1870 in many ways marks an epoch. It was won, as Renan said, more by Germany's universities than by her schools, and showed how the policy of becoming *the* educational State of the world, which was inaugurated by Fichte, Stein, and Wilhelm von Humboldt, had, in two generations, made out of a race naturally discordant, almost exterminated politically after the battle of Jena, and with the worst strategic position in history, the strongest military power since ancient Rome. Soon after the war the University of Strassburg was built with great magnificence on conquered soil over against the old Academy of Nancy, as if to show France what Germany could do for higher education. "We will be lavish here," said Bismarck to the Cultus Minister. The old University of Kiel was totally rebuilt on land won in 1866 in the Schleswig-Holstein war, not far from the Danish University at Copenhagen. Breslau has been reconstructed, over against the Russian Dorpat, and even Halle has now an ideal medical installation as if to compete with Saxon Leipzig. A series of magnificent university buildings have been erected in Berlin, culminating in the great technical school, where $2,300,000 was put into one building, close to the new *Reichs-Anstalt*, for research only. This, of which Helmholtz is at the head, was first occupied last year, and cost $1,000,000 more. Vienna has erected the most expensive single university building in the world, costing nearly $4,000,000, and now the medical department there hopes for another no less costly. Internal reconstructions of the most far-reaching and comprehensive kind, of which we shall speak later, have also been accomplished or begun.

Since her defeat, France has magnanimously adopted the policy of her victor in an educational effort without parallel in history, which, in the language of one of its ministers, has engaged the best talent of the nation for fifteen years, and involved a steady increase of the yearly educational budget, which has reached a little over 700 per cent since 1876. Prominent among the reconstructions here is the great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development of the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* founded by Duruy, which strives to select the best students and professors by means of scholarships, additional salaries and opportunities, and, in a word, to differentiate in quality. The *École Libre des Sciences Politiques*, founded in a burst of patriotism just after the war by private subscription, is perhaps now, under the admirable leadership of M. Boutmy, the most advanced school of social and political science in the world. Hardly less admirable or unique is the *Musée Guimet*, with its unprecedented collections for the study of comparative religions, installed in its new building in 1879, with three series of publications, and affiliated with the lecture-courses of thirteen professors. A new policy of decentralization, to give each of the seventeen academies local autonomy; the revolutionary policy of esoteric courses, seminaries, and laboratories, in a land where all instruction had been open to all—thus putting a policy of university concentration in place of the opposite policy of university extension now popular here and in England; the establishment of twenty-one new chairs in Paris alone; the development of the pedagogy of higher education, to which so much of the best talent in France has of late been devoted; the repeated but not yet successful attempts to establish independent universities of the German type; the magnificent building of the new Sorbonne, not yet complete, but estimated to cost not less than $3,200,000; the new buildings of the *Collège de France* and the Medical School,—and all this since 1875, when Claude Bernard spoke of the French laboratories as the "tombs of savants,"—constitute a movement upward that is sublime and in many respects almost pathetic.

The same movement, in greater or less degree, is seen everywhere. Italy, since the noble efforts of Minister Bacelli, who proposed a total reform of her fourteen universities, has grappled with the task of subordinating the weak to the strong. One cannot read the reports of her new Council of thirty-two picked men; the lofty ideals set forth by Martello; see the palatial new buildings of Turin and the yet more comprehensive plans of Naples; or converse with the men most prominent in the new movement,—without realizing that the ideals of the mediæval Italian universities are reviving in new ambition for intellectual leadership. Holland has built anew and vaster upon the old foundations at Amsterdam, and seems to be allowing the provincial university at Gröningen to lapse. Sweden has now, thanks to Professor Retzius and his noble and wealthy wife, what is practically a new science university at Stockholm, complemented by a new conserva-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive university for the humanities at Götheburg, while both Lund and Upsala have new and expensive buildings. Russia radically reconstructed her seven universities in 1884, including even the new University of Finland at Helsingfors; and four years later the Siberian University was founded at Tomsk, where the best professorial salaries in Russia are now paid, and to which friends of exiles contributed money, books, and personal ornaments. Athens has near its university a new Academy costing about $1,000,000, built of Pentelican marble by M. Sina, a retired merchant, and for which the forty "immortals" are now being selected. At Buda-Pesth, Ghent, Aix-la-Chapelle, everywhere, we find far-reaching and radical reconstruction. Japan, after prolonged international study, appears to have made a happy combination of the best elements in the Imperial University, which is the chief instrument in the rapid transformation of that country and of unique interest to the student of education. In South America there are traces of reform movements, especially in the universities of Chili and Buenos Ayres.

Great Britain is now making rapid progress. In Oxford, and more particularly Cambridge, the University, almost annihilated by the statutes of Laud, has been slowly gaining upon the still predominating colleges, the rivalry being especially felt in the newer movements of science led by the former. The opening of the University of Wales last fall, to which its three colleges are tributary; the long-expected, yet still delayed, report of the University Commission at Edinburgh; and more especially the report of 1894 on the projected Gresham University at London, which is to federate London University as well as University College, King's College, seven of the hospital medical schools, and perhaps ultimately even the Inns of Court, making ample provision for research and the most advanced work; in Canada, the ideal physico-technical building just dedicated at Montreal, and the federation movement at Toronto, whereby denominational colleges are moving in from the Provinces and co-ordinating their work with the University,—all show that a new era has dawned.

Such salient facts in connection with the vast extension of the lower schools in provinces like North Africa, Egypt, New Zealand (which latter Dr. Fitch said had now an almost ideal school system), which mark new departures in colonial policy, paralleled by new methods of missionary work which bring teaching rather than preaching to the front, all show how unanimous the sentiment of the world now is about education. While philosophers have been seeking a consensus of opinion, and the church a consensus of doctrines that should be truly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

catholic and ecumenical, education has silently *become* the one thing which all men who differ ever so much in creed, culture, sect, and race, now practically agree to believe in. If such merely geographical and numerical universality of faith seem to make education in general an almost holy cause, how much more so is the conviction of the best, *semper ubique et ab omnibus*, that we must learn what some of us had well-nigh forgotten, viz.: how to train superior minds to the leadership which is their right; how to separate talent from mediocrity. In mechanics, powers must be developed over a large surface, but applied at a small one; so mass-education must focus in expressing the inner aim and ripest ideals of the best, and thus *mens agitat moles*.

Before passing now to discuss some individual elements in this upward movement, let us state the one general principle which underlies the whole problem. As the world is now realizing, school and university are not ends in themselves; but every element of an educational system, not only courses of study, but buildings, seats, hours, laws, methods, gymnastics, etc., are means to the right development of the youthful soul and body, to the nature and needs of which it must be forever plastic, and in better knowledge of and adaptation to which all educational progress and reform consist. Hence it has come that the new psychology, which studies the body as well as the mind; which experiments on the senses, memory, association, attention, etc., in the laboratory; that utilizes nature's cruel experiments by laborious and systematic observation upon the insane, blind, deaf, idiots, paupers, and criminals; that explores the laws and nature of growth in childhood, animal instinct, savage customs and beliefs; that has already shed so much light upon the nature and growth of volition and motor powers, and is now approaching the awful mysteries of feeling and the religious life,—is the very heart and marrow of the higher as well as of the lower pedagogy; the arsenal of the surest, safest, and most progressive ideas, and is coming to be a court of appeal in all educational questions. Its study is now indispensable, not only for all who would aid in making education, as it ought to be, the science of human nature and the art of unfolding it, but for all who wish to approach politics, social or religious questions, or even science, from a higher standpoint, or deal with them in the large way they now demand. As we enter what is sometimes called the psychological era, where so many branches of knowledge are bringing their deepest and choicest insights to a sort of harvest-home in the holy city of Man-Soul,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we realize how much we have lost from the backward state of psycho-physic studies in the past, and are better enabled to approach the boundless questions of education from larger, higher, and clearer standpoints.

The part of this vast field which here concerns us is the nature and needs of the ephebic or adolescent period, itself a great subject and still imperfectly known, yet upon which the history of education and of student life, confessional autobiographies, certain suggestive novels and other literature, dismal and recently opened lines of psycho-pathology and a few special investigations have shed much new light. A brief characterization from a fuller treatise in preparation must here suffice. The advent of this period is marked by rapid growth in weight, height, beard, change of voice, vague and undefined longing, reveries, new sensations, impulses, emotions, tastes, and instincts. New traits, come to the fore at this time of moulting, pin-feathers, and hobbledehoyishness. Although traces of hereditary diseases now often first appear; and although the slowly ripening seeds of all the here rapidly increasing neuroses of fatigue are very easily rooted, there is for a time lessened liability to either sickness or death. Just as, in learning to talk, the child shows phases of all the speech diseases, and, as Mr. Hancock shows, manifests the text-book symptoms of all the motor diseases in learning to use his muscles, so the young pubescent often shows signs of many insanities of intellect, will, and especially feeling, but all of which healthy natures outgrow without a trace. All seems solvent, plastic, vulnerable as never before to every suggestion or infection of good or evil in the whole environment. The youth would know, do, be, feel, all things by turns, but often nothing long: therefore it is the season for hints, glimpses, *apperçus*, for grafting the soul all over with buds. Herbart thought it the best time for developing all-sided interests; it is seed-time and not harvest. The early stages of this ferment, if ever, seem the fit time for so-called liberal studies, for something like the old college course with its wide and many-sided periscope in many directions. A general course is then the best beginning for the "remnant" who are to be specialized toward an intellectual as distinct from an active life, and conforms to the above principle that power is best developed over a large surface now, and best applied at a small one later. The great loss, however, comes from the fact that these studies are several years too late in this country, and the misfit is all the greater because during these years growth is most rapid.

Some now hold that during the first years of life our personality is mosaicked together out of brain-centres for speech, vision, hearing,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

motion, etc., which had unfolded in relative independence, and that if the composition is not well proportioned we are forever ear-, eye-, or motor-minded; while if these elements are not firmly welded together we are liable to decompositions of our personality by shock or strain, as in hypnotism. However it be with infancy, there is no doubt that the former self is in a sense broken up at puberty, and that there is a long period of storm and stress ere the new creature of the physiological second birth is fully compacted together, so that the shelter or "safety," which Mark Hopkins would first of all ensure in college, is essential. In this country, with all its excitements and precocities, and especially with our mongrel blood, with strains so numerous and diverse, the case is, I think, far different than with a pure, homogeneous stock like the Jews, or even the Germans: the seething is not only greater, but longer. But if there is increased danger of both stunting and collapse, there is also the possibility of later but higher and more complete unity in the "cosmic, super-man" of the future. As there is a trophic or nutritive background for all the processes of our physical life, so these impulses are the raw material out of which all the great deeds, long labors of discovery, the triumphs of love, war, and religion are made. There are crises and reactions which made Plato call this the age of perpetual drunkenness. There must be a healthy glow and flux of feeling, good will, elastic buoyancy, joy of living: this is the life of which our nerves must not be scant, but must have more and fuller. It is this that is first asked for in the universal forms of greeting, "How are you," "How do you feel," etc. This is the "heart" out of which are the issues of life. Youth who lack this are undervitalized: they can write, perhaps, a decent satire, burlesque, or even criticism, or carry a goodly amount of culture; but they can never be creative or original, because they lack the divine power of active appreciation, reverence and sympathy.

The best thing about *genuine* youth is that it cannot and will not interest itself in what it feels to be formal, trifling, dry, insincere, or of less than the highest worth. The history of student life shows plainly that not only its riots but its debaucheries are worse when and where courses are lean, professors not absorbed in their work, not loved and respected because they fail to impregnate with high ideals; or else where masses of students have been brought together who never can and who never should have attempted to lead the life of the mind. If young men fail of zeal and ardor on a high plane, they are more prone to seek it on a low one, so that every in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tellectual interest has some value as a palliative or alterative, or psycho-kinetic equivalent of inebriation or degraded love. Every healthy youthful soul has a strong and eager curiosity which bad pedagogy alone can kill. It blindly circumnutates like a vine to find some Jacob's ladder up which it can climb, where the lower can be changed into the higher love, as Plato dimly suggested in the "Symposium." How far the *integer vitæ scelerisque purus* of ideal student life can degenerate before it is known if the fires on the Muses' sacred hills are allowed to grow dim, and how immedicable are low academic customs and traditions when once established, their history abundantly shows.

The true student here must mature slowly, and there must be much that retards by broadening, and broadens by retarding. That wondrous yeast, the most complex and mysterious of all the products of life, which the great Biologos secretes at this age, if it is ever to leaven the whole of our lumpish nature must be of the slow-rising kind. While the human brain reaches its maximal size and weight at fifteen to sixteen, it is unique among the organs in that it takes a decade longer, with vast changes in its mode of action and increase of power, before it reaches full functional maturity. The regimen for this long period of functional growth should be radically different from the earlier period when the vital energies are chiefly focussed upon growth in size. Not only does man spend a larger fraction of his average life than animals in growing, beginning with the greatest helplessness of them all, but the prolongation of infancy is greater in high than in low races. Colored children and those of low stock are often as bright as others, if not more so; but at from six to twelve they fall behind, and their educational period closes. So, too, after puberty, eugenic youth (excluding geniuses and one-sided precocities) keep on developing power, as Mr. Yoder shows, until full physical maturity in the early thirties, and full intellectual maturity, which Plato thought touched its zenith at forty-nine. Now while there is hardly a savage tribe that has not marked the advent of this period by its most solemn rites, ceremonials, and initiations; while it is the period for confirmation in the Russian, Lutheran, Episcopalian, and Catholic churches; and while, as Dr. Daniels has shown, most conversions occur among other denominations; as it was the time when Roman guardianship ended and the Greek youth had a mentor or "inspirer,"—I think we may say, anthropologically, that it is the period when education as a conscious, special, or public function

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

began, and that it has slowly developed as civilization has advanced, downward to the kindergarten and—what here concerns us—upward toward an ever-increasing maturity of post-graduate work, seminary, laboratory, research, as both the growing body of knowledge and the modern psychologic laws of specialization now make needful.

One of the chief dangers of this period is that the sexual elements of soul and body will be developed prematurely or disproportionally. This is but one of the many functions of adolescence. It should ripen very slowly and with the least practicable consciousness. Early maturity in this respect is the worst kind of precocity and physiological specialization. Nature meant sex to be a sort of *hors d'œuvre*, and not the chief course of the meal, as many Frenchy fashions—that have made the noble word "realistic" almost mean *risqué*—suggest. One of the greatest living teachers of physiology said that nine-tenths of the thoughts and feelings of the average young man centre for a few years about this function. I do not believe it, but opine that, quite apart from their intrinsic value, intellectual interests, athletics, friendships, social and æsthetic tastes, plain living, and high thinking should serve the purposes of preoccupation before compensating powers of control unfold. If hypertrophied, this element sucks up all that is vile in the environment and dwarfs every power of mind and body. Its desolation is chiefly wrought in the realm of feeling, causing emotional abnormalities, perversions, and defects. The heart is not whole. Life burns out into a premature old age, which, instead of being wise, happy, and respected, is wretched and contemptible. In place of the supreme "cosmic joy" of being alive, there is the woe of a Flaubert who says things nauseate him until he wishes he were a stone; of Baudelaire, that dandy of spleen and paradox, who found life a *supplicium neuricum;* of Verlaine, and other decadents and pessimists whose well-springs of life have run dry. From a large biological standpoint I believe, with no fear of Weismann, that he is the best man, and she the best woman, who can bear the best children; that nothing is fully learned till it is so deeply a part of us that it would affect our children if we did not live to see them. Here is a judgment-day function that brings home to us the net resultant of the good and evil in our and our ancestors' lives. Now it is partly because our stock is mixed of so many bloods that we find temperance, in the large Aristotelian sense, so hard. This element should dawn slowly, with many heralds and far-off approaches in the sphere of friendships, idealism, sentiments,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and humanities, and we may well speak of "falling" in love if it specializes before body and soul are full grown.

After the first rapid growth in weight and size, muscular power unfolds with waxing and then waning rapidity for a decade or more. Like their father, most sons of Adam have found work the best antidote for forbidden fruit. Muscles are half the adult body by weight, have built cities, waged wars, written books, and done all that man has accomplished in the world. Thought we now deem repressed action. Doing is also an organ of knowing. Our deepest beliefs root in preconscious action-habits. What we do preforms the soul and is a kind of *Vorfrucht* for thought. To well-blooded youth pure intellect sometimes seems a realm of shadowy ghosts; abstract thoughts a dead kind of knowledge, or dried feelings pressed and labelled. What an ideal pedagogic environment could be composed out of the best elements of old New England farm life with the germs of half of all the industries of the census within easy reach, such as that lately essayed to fit younger sons of British noblemen for colonial life! Soldiering has seasoned the bodies of youth in ancient Greece and Rome and in modern Europe. So great was the glory of the Olympic games, says Professor Gildersleeve, in substance, that night and death never seemed so black as by contrast with their splendor. Cities competed for the honor of being the birthplace of the young victor and pulled down their walls to admit him; sculptors immortalized his form; and Pindar, who said no one was great who was not great with his hands and feet, raised his triumph to the plane of the eternal prevalence of good over evil. None have understood or loved young men like the Greeks. As the first taste of blood fires the young lion's soul, so athletic triumphs give foregleams of fame which will be all the more likely to be sought later in higher and more enduring forms. When Jahn founded his patriotic Turner societies in Germany it was with the motto *frisch*, *frei*, *fröhlich*, *fromm*, and with the ideal of doing all mechanically possible for the body to do, thus enfranchising the soul because only strong muscles could make men great or nations free. In the relations of exercise to regimen and exposure, in the dangers of a spurty and erethic diathesis, the laws of training and reaction, of accessory and fundamental activities, in the dangers of precocious specialization, as in the over-use of the tiny pen- and tongue-wagging muscles, we now have, as I hope to show in a later article, an amazing advance within our reach in both theory and practice.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are now the best of psycho-physiological reasons for holding conversion or change of heart before pubescence as another dwarfing precocity. The age at which the child Jesus entered the temple is as early as any child ought to go about his Heavenly Father's business, if not indeed too early with our climate, temperament, and life. To prescribe a set of strong feelings at this age may introvert attention on physical states, increase passional activities, issue in a sort of self-flirtation or abnormal self-consciousness, or lapse to the supreme selfishness of incipient and often unsuspected hysteria. According to the Aristotelian *katharsis* the soul is purged of bad passions by stage representations of them; so by the forcing method of early piety the soul gets just enough religious stimulus to vaccinate it against deeper and more serious interests later. It is because of this haste for immediate results that we so often hear childish sentiments and puerile expressions strangely mingled in the prayer-meeting experiences of otherwise mature men, like manly tones alternating with boyish falsetto. "It did not seem modest for my girl to hear," said a cultivated and devout German mother who had sent her thirteen-year-old daughter from the room while I was describing revival scenes I had witnessed in this country. If children are instructed in the language of these sentiments too early, the deepening and broadening of mind and conscience which should come with adolescent years will be incomplete. I have heard revival sermons addressed to young children which seemed to exhort them to imagine themselves married people and to inculcate the duties of that relation. Precocious children are apt to be conceited and full of pious affectations all the forenoon of life, but commonplace all its afternoon and evening.

I plead not for less but more and wiser religious training. The Bible is such a pedagogic masterpiece that "divine" and "inspired" mean too little rather than too much. It is now being re-revealed as man's great text-book in psychology, dealing with him as a whole in body, mind, will, and all higher relations. It has been misapprehended only because it is so deeply divine, and my complaint is that its teachers do not know and believe it deeply enough to bring out all its power. But to understand it we must begin with nature. During most of its history our race has worshipped heavenly bodies, trees, flowers, animals, and things. Now, instead of living in the country alone with nature half their lives, knowing, feeling, loving her, men are born and die in cities, always with their kind, and as careless as ignorant of all nature's ways. Some years ago, by careful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual study, I found that 60 per cent of the six-year-old children entering Boston schools had never seen a robin, 18 per cent had never seen a cow, some thinking it as big as their thumb or the picture, thus making mere verbal cram of all instruction about milk, cheese, butter, leather, etc. Over 60 per cent had never seen growing corn, blackberries, or potatoes; 71 per cent did not know beans—even in Boston; and in 109 other topics primers generally presuppose the percentage of ignorance of nature was such as to give pathos to the idea of some, that good people, when they die, go into the country. Urban youth now rarely feel the healthy old pagan love of nature, but get it, if at all, from secondary sources, like John Burroughs, Thoreau, Richard Jeffries, Hamilton Gibson. Thus, as Mr. Hoyt shows, it is no wonder that a British Commission report that the study and teaching of natural science in intermediate schools is declining. To approach the study of animal nature through the mazes of histological technique, with no previous sympathetic groundwork, is another precocity or inversion. After the altruism of adolescence has been fanned by social habits of city life, the love of nature upon which science rests is hard to graft. More country life in contact with God's primitive revelation in nature will lay better foundations both for science and Christian character. The latter will not then be jeopardized by a little muddle about Trinity, miracles, or inspiration, because religious life will not be built on the sand.

Our complex temperament and life I believe often need, at the dawn of the physiological *vita nuova*, a vigorous transcendental cult; morality now needs religion. Previous ethical training should now be brought to a focus of personal application best made according to the parents' creed. Duties should seem Divine commands. The soul must be braced up and put to work. The strongest motives, natural and supernatural, are not too strong to regulate the new impulses and desires which are here so sudden. A new and deep sense of personal purity and impurity causes a moral tension which is the great opportunity of the religious teacher. A sense of God within, of responsibilities which seem to transcend this life because they do the youth's power of comprehension, a feeling for duties and of a vaster future life—these are the roots of religion, the elements of that theology of the heart revealed to every serious youth, the judicious emphasis and utilization of which often require the most consummate skill. If the ideal and transcendent to poet, priest, or philosopher, had been only a pedagogic regulator of the human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

energies now set free, it would have had great justification on this ground alone.

But piety should be a slow, because most complex, growth, at least for the student, more often than a sudden conquest. To lead young men through college without enlarging the crude religious notions of childhood is impossible. The time of faith alone without works, or of conversion alone without a little philosophy, at least ethics, is happily forever gone. We have now at least 128 American text-books designed as the culmination of a college course, usually taught by the President during the senior year,—and often written by him,—intended to open the mind to ultimate problems, but not to open it too far to be tolerably closed up at the end of the course. A careful study of these text-books and a class-room experience with many of them shows clearly that this is a distinctly American solution of a great problem, and well fitted for the early stages of a country like ours.

A few teachers of these subjects would now have no reserves, but exploit the natural self-estrangement of an age of flitting queries, whether I am really I, or the world is really real, to the uttermost, and initiate into all the metaphysical orgies of the mind. Some of them wage eternal war with the naïve and the instinctive, encourage doubt of all we cannot prove, reduce students to the condition of primitive thinkers, making *tabula rasa* of all forms of settled consensus. They deem it a pedagogic triumph to worry men about the logical nature of the universe, and make them ask whether the world really satisfies the idea of rationality. They forget that if our ethnic basis should ever evolve a national philosophy it will be as indigenous as was the Greek or the German. Our nerves are not tonic enough, to be sure, to play again those soul-quaking melodies of Calvinistic conviction of sin or Socratic conviction of ignorance as they have been played in the past, but young men should not be led toward paranoias, nor their enthusiasm toned down into indifference; they should not be made self-centred and solipsistic at an age when altruism ought to have its golden day. Even if this be claimed for the few who are to profess philosophy as a vocation, we must not make men so inspired by the great that they cannot be faithful to the small, nor give them a culture *qui sert à tout mais ne suffit à rien*, so that they can never specialize or do research. It is for fear of such results that the Catholic Church stops short at Aquinas, and that Russia now forbids even mediæval as well as contemporary philosophy in her universities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We cannot here exhaust all the treatments prescribed for this critical age when young men more than boys hate to do, think, or be like all others, and, instead of being *replicas* or specimens, strive to do the exceptional. The Greeks and Germans prescribed a philosophy which grew out of the *ethos*, *nomos*, *muthos*, *logos*, of their race and age. The Romans cadenced the soul with rhetoric and oratory; the Jesuits magnified the natural instincts of rivalry and competition; the Puritans and Ascetics the sense of sin and impurity. All believe in leisure, which is the meaning of the very word "school." We have found, but not yet fully learned how to use, modern science, which, even if it be like Kant's island in the midst of a foggy and unknown sea, does make more compactly woven brain-tissue that saves the soul from the shocks of the unexpected, fortifies it against disaster, and is now suggesting a new function of thought, viz: to distribute energy among the brain centres, to compensate points of high by points of low pressure, and thus make for sanity and unity.

Why can we not know more than these fragmentary hints and glimpses about this new world of the soul in which we are now aborigines? Why are we so tantalized here by the noetic passion when we have already realized that human nature alone is true, that all that does not square with it is false, and that all that does not help it upward is worthless? Philosophic studies have not done their duty in this respect, but have turned into false ways. There is no better test of educational institutions, philosophies, or states, than how they have dealt with this evermore prolonged ephebic period, how they have husbanded and applied its forces, whether they have been turned toward muscle, sentiment, thought, or sense, and how far the lower has been transpeciated into the higher, and how far toward the complete maturity of the ideal man of the future development has yet been brought. It is from some such standpoint that I shall now pass to discussion of some of the chief and most pressing questions in the new upward movement in university life and work in this country.

G. STANLEY HALL.

[The discussion of this subject will be continued in later numbers of THE FORUM.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRUE MEANING OF FARM-MORTGAGE STATISTICS.

It has never fallen to any economist or student of the social order in this or any other country to present such evidence of wealth, welfare, energy, and thrift as will be put before the readers of this article.

Agriculture gave employment to 44 per cent of all who were occupied in gainful pursuits in 1880. If we add to those who are directly occupied upon the field and the farm, all who are engaged in the distribution of food and fibres, by river, lake, rail, and wagon, it will be proved that more than one-half the population of this country gets its living directly from the land or in moving the crops. The price of food material, to 90 per cent of the whole population of this country, requires an expenditure of nearly, and in many instances of more than, half the family income. How much of the work of the household is applied—and in considerable measure wasted—in the preparation of the food, each reader will judge.

Keeping in view these facts, the dominant influence governing the future welfare and destiny of this country and assuring the stability of our institutions will be made manifest by the one fact of greatest importance that could be developed by any statistical investigation. It is this: *There are within the United States 4,564,641 separate farms, averaging about 137 acres each, of which, in the Eastern, Middle, Western, and Pacific States, 80 per cent are occupied and managed by their owners. Far more than one-half these farms are free of any mortgage whatever; the rest are mortgaged for far less than half their value.* In the South there are large numbers of farms rented to black farmers who work the land on shares with the owner.

The area of the United States, omitting Alaska, comprises in round figures 1,900,000,000 acres. Somewhat less than one-third of this area, or 623,218,619 acres, is now occupied as farm property and is assessed and valued under that title. As shown by the Eleventh Census (1890) the farms are classified as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	NUMBER
Under 10 acres	150,194
Over 10 and under 20 acres	265,550
" 20 and under 50 "	902,777
" 50 and under 100 "	1,121,485
" 100 and under 500 "	2,008,694
" 500 and under 1,000 "	84,395
" 1,000 acres and over	31,546

In the decade covering the years 1880 to 1889 inclusive, the population of this country increased 24.86 per cent. In this period a comparison made year by year of the number of mortgages on real estate of all descriptions (except that owned by quasi-public corporations, discloses the fact that there was a progressive increase both in number and in amount. The amount registered in 1889 exceeded that of 1880 by 156 per cent. There was a lessening in this progressive increase in the years 1883 and 1884, which were years—especially the latter—of commercial depression; but the progressive tendency throughout the decade gives evidence of the progress of this country in wealth and welfare during this period. This view of the matter is the very reverse of the construction which is usually given to these facts.

The following comparisons will illustrate the point which I wish to bring out: There was a relative increase in the production of grain until, at the latter part of the decade, it had become in excess either of consumption or of export at a profit. In other elements of progress the figures below give the ratio of increase:

Population	25 per cent
Production of grain	43 " "
Number of teachers in the public schools	74 " "
Railway mileage	86 " "
Postal receipts	87 " "
Contracts for insurance against loss by fire (the best indication of the increase of property subject to loss)	104 " "
Production of iron and of steel (average)	170 " "
Amount of mortgage incurred	156 " "
In 1879 the *per capita* national debt ($40.86) exceeded that of 1889 ($15.86) by	157 " "

The close analogy between the relative diminution of the national debt and the relative increase in the mortgage debt on acres and lots will be remarked, varying but one per cent in rate. It may not be assumed that the same identical money repaid on the national debt to the creditors of the nation was lent on mortgage to Western farmers, but the result was practically the same, and the comparison will hold. The national debt was incurred in the destructive pursuits of the Civil War. It represented so much of the result of productive in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustry that might have become useful capital, which was expended in a contest of a destructive order. This contest was constructive in the best sense, in establishing personal liberty, but in its progress it was destructive of all the material products consumed. Subsequently to the war, from year to year the people were taxed for payment of its cost, the proportion being at the rate of $1.50 per head annually in excess of the cost of conducting the government. This sum derived from taxation was applied to the liquidation of the debt at the ratio named. An equal sum or more was loaned on the mortgages on homes and farms year by year for constructive purposes, the object of the borrowers being to become possessed of land, to open and develop farms, to construct dwelling-houses, and to provide homes for their families,—these objects being the very reverse of the destructive expenditures of war. In the one case the debt was incurred in defence of the principle of personal liberty; in the other the debt was incurred for the purpose of increasing the production of the comforts and necessaries of life, or for improving the dwelling-places of the mass of the people.

In this same decade the condition of the great body of the people who earn their living either on the farm, where the farmers work as hard as their hired men, or as wage-earners who earn small or moderate compensation in other ways,—numbering at least 90 per cent of all who are occupied in gainful pursuits,—had steadily improved down to the end of the year 1892.

In 1893 came the panic, promoting a financial crisis and an industrial paralysis which had long been foreseen, but of which the date could never be predicted in advance. This long foreseen result of tampering with the standard of value of the nation may be wholly attributed to the shock given to credit by the preceding monetary legislation and the threat of the free coinage of depreciated silver. The conditions of the country at the beginning of 1893 were conducive to normal prosperity; but, through the incapacity of legislators, our country, which is the richest and most lightly taxed nation in the world, has been subjected to hardships such as afflict the poorest states of Europe. The year 1893 must be excepted and dealt with separately in any analysis of industrial progress. The record of 1893 will stand for all time in evidence of the fact that by means of Interstate Commerce acts which have obstructed the railway service, and by acts for debasing the standard of value, our whole commerce among ourselves and with other nations has been interrupted, our industry has been paralyzed, and the want of the very necessaries of life by great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

numbers of people had been brought about in the midst of an excessive abundance of the means of living, with unused capital waiting for a return of confidence, to be expended in giving employment to those who were forced to live in enforced idleness through no fault of their own.

Since the resumption of specie payment, Jan. 1, 1879, wages have advanced, prices have been reduced, and the cost of production and distribution has been greatly diminished.

Under these conditions there had been also a more rapid accumulation of capital than had ever before occurred in this country, with a corresponding reduction in the rate of interest. This increase of capital led to greater facilities being extended to borrowers on mortgage who might desire either to develop a farm or to establish a home. This opportunity to borrow capital at moderate and lessening rates of interest constituted one of the most important factors in the general progress of the community as a whole. Yet these favorable conditions had been so little comprehended, and so much complaint had been made of the fall in prices, especially of farm products, that a special investigation of the subject of mortgages on farms and homes was ordered by Congress in the year 1889, the motive of the promoters being apparently to prove that excessive burdens rested upon Western lands. The result of that investigation has sustained the conclusions which I had reached by a very partial investigation of the same subject in the preceding five years, namely:

1. *That the larger part of the Western farms cultivated by owners were free of any mortgage whatever.*

2. *That the Western farmers were creditors rather than debtors.*

3. *That the burden of farm mortgages is a very light one.*

In fact, the statistics of this partial investigation, which was necessarily very limited, had led me to the conclusion that there existed no great body of the people of any class in this country, who were, as a whole, so free from debt and so absolutely independent as the Western farmers of the grain-growing States.

In making provision for the census of 1890 a special appropriation of $1,000,000 was set apart to be expended in ascertaining the exact condition of farms and homes with respect to mortgages. A more useful appropriation could not have been made for any statistical purpose. Mr. George K. Holmes and Mr. John S. Lord were deputed by the Superintendent of the Census to do this work, and there could have been no more judicious selection. On the 19th of December an extra census bulletin was issued, giving the statistics of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the decade from 1880 to 1889 inclusive, in thirty-three States and Territories. The total mortgage indebtedness of the whole country has been ascertained, and it is stated that this detailed report of thirty-three States covers seven-ninths of the mortgages made in the United States during the decade, and that the outstanding mortgage debt on the 1st of January, 1890, given in this report, covers substantially five-sixths of the entire mortgage debt on acres and lots in the whole country.

In the compilation of these mortgages the encumbrance on acres is separated from those on lots. A complete separation of mortgages on farms as distinct from acres has not been fully completed. There are many parcels of land in the vicinity of cities, counted under the head of "acres" which are under mortgage, that are held for future sale in lots, and which therefore ought not to be strictly considered as farms. A portion of these acres in the vicinity of cities is devoted to market-gardening, and some of these acres are used for business purposes. Therefore the freedom of the farmer from mortgage is greater than is proved by the figures subsequently given, as I have mainly dealt with the facts as if mortgages on acres were strictly synonymous with mortgages on farms.

This huge work of investigation required a most complete organization, as the data on mortgages had to be taken from the registries of deeds in every county in the Union. The method of estimating values was to take the assessed value of the real estate in each county, and to raise that estimate to the extent of the supposed undervaluation of assessors. This undervaluation was determined by county and municipal officers who were consulted, corroborated by returns received from more than 25,000 inquiries addressed to persons throughout the country who were familiar with the valuation of real estate and with the doings of the assessors. A separate and limited investigation of "farm and home" proprietorship and indebtedness was made, as distinguished from "acres and lots," in respect to a part of those which were encumbered. In this analysis the value of these specific "farms and homes" was estimated by the owners, and it was found to be consistent with other returns.

In these mortgage statistics which were first compiled under the direction of Mr. R. P. Porter, then Superintendent of the Census, and which have been completed under the supervision of Mr. Carroll D. Wright, the present Superintendent, coupled with the monumental Report on Prices and Wages, compiled under the superintendence of Commissioner Wright, by order of the Finance Committee of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senate, by Dr. E. R. L. Gould and others of his associates, we have a basis for an inductive social science, such as has never existed before.

The first and most obvious general deduction from the statistics of "farms and homes," as well as of "acres and lots," is the vast number of the owners of small parcels of land, and the paramount importance of agriculture among the pursuits of the people of this country. Whatever may be the temporary influence of a few shallow and discontented persons who prate about cheap money, socialism, and the like, this great body of owners of real property which has been developed mainly by themselves, however slow they may be in action, are sure in the end to forbid any wild or revolutionary work being done either by legislation or agitation. They are sure in the end to sustain right and judicious methods in the final adjustment of the difficult economic questions which have been developed in our monetary and revenue systems since the end of the Civil War. Evolution rather than revolution will be the order on which these men will move.

The first startling fact developed by the mortgage statistics is that in these specific thirty-three States and Territories nearly 7,000,000 mortgages have been recorded in ten years for a total sum of nearly $9,500,000,000. The final statement, covering the whole country, which has not yet been published, discloses the fact that 9,517,747 mortgages were executed in the decade 1880–1889, to the amount of $12,094,877,793.

That single fact will doubtless be cited in evidence of the hardships of life among Western farmers and owners of small parcels of land on which their dwellings are built. These figures have already been brought in evidence against the so-called "Shylocks" and "gold-bugs" by whom the money is said to have been lent.

On the 1st of January, 1890, the amount of these mortgages remaining unpaid in thirty-three States was $4,935,455,896; in the whole United States, $6,019,679,985. It therefore appears that during the decade one-half the mortgage debt incurred had already been paid. The amount of mortgages outstanding at the beginning of this decade has not been ascertained; it can only be inferred by deductions from the growth of mortgages since its beginning. The least estimate of the sum due on acres and lots at the beginning of this period would be $1,500,000,000.

These original mortgages executed prior to 1880 must have been wholly liquidated, mostly by payment. Evidence obtained from solvent farm-mortgage companies proves that, as fast as they matured,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they were either finally paid, or else in some instances new mortgages were executed at much lower rates of interest than were customary in the era of paper money in the previous decade. On this basis the summary would be:

Mortgages in force January 1, 1880, estimated	$1,500,000,000
Executed since	12,000,000,000
Total	$13,500,000,000
In force, January 1, 1890	6,000,000,000
Paid	$7,500,000,000

The payments therefore amounted to 55 per cent, yet at the end of the decade the mortgage debt on acres and lots was $6,000,000,000.

A loud outcry has been made by the Populists and the advocates of cheap money, in support of the free coinage of silver, and other devices in fraud of both debtors and creditors alike, upon the ground that this is an unbearable burden. We must therefore wrest from these statistics their true meaning. Figures never lie except when liars make figures, but true figures may be made to lie by him whose purpose is not to present the truth. On January 1, 1890, 65.83 per cent of the outstanding mortgages were upon lots, with which it is not my purpose to deal; 34.17 per cent in point of number were upon acres, which in this analysis I deal with as synonymous with farms, although by so doing I do not prove the full independence of the farmer. An estimate of the amount on actual farms will be subsequently given.

The average mortgage on lots was $1,540, by far the greater number being less than $1,000. People of moderate means had in this decade secured lots of land for their own homes more rapidly than ever before, being enabled to do so by the increase of capital and the facilities for borrowing at lessening rates of interest.

Dealing with the mortgages on farms, we find that the average life of a farm mortgage is a little less than five years,—rather longer in the East than in the West, but practically five years in the grain-growing States. The total number of mortgages given on acres, which were outstanding in the United States, January 1, 1890, was 2,302,941, carrying an encumbrance of $2,209,148,431. The average farm mortgage was therefore $959. Again, we find that by far the greater number of these mortgages are for medium amounts. Over 6 per cent (6.11) were executed for sums under $100; 46 per cent were for sums under $500, and 70.21 per cent were for sums under $1,000,—leaving less than 30 per cent in point of number as representative of larger mortgages, the biggest of which are in the Territory of Arizona.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We may now begin to throw a little light upon the true nature of mortgage indebtedness by the figures of the increase. Let me repeat: The growth of population was 25 per cent; the number of mortgages executed in 1889 as compared with 1880 show an increase of 90 per cent; the amount of mortgages registered, an increase of 156 per cent. To the superficial mind this may give evidence of hardship, but it is a notable fact that the lessening of mortgages in number and amount was during the period of business depression in 1883 and 1884. The average number of acres to each mortgage in the decade was 118; the number of acres encumbered in ten years 622,855,091. The total acreage of the United States exclusive of Alaska is 1,900,000,000. Nearly one-third part of the acres of the United States were, therefore, placed under mortgage in the decade named. The debt increased three times more than the estimated wealth, and six times more than the population. The rate of interest on actual farm mortgages in twenty-one principal States, selected for this specific analysis, varied from 5½ per cent in Massachusetts to 6 and 7 per cent in the Middle West; rising to 10 per cent in the recently occupied States and Territories, averaging on farms a fraction under 7 per cent. This rate was much lower than in the previous decade on a paper-money basis.

In order to bring out the evidence of prosperity rather than adversity developed in these conditions, one must ask, What does a man, in fact, borrow, when he executes a mortgage upon land? He does not borrow money in a true sense. In a vast number of cases only a title to money passes in the form of a check, a draft, or a bill of exchange. What he in fact borrows is the land itself, or such part of it as the encumbrance represents. If we regard foreclosure as a sign of lack of benefit to the borrower, the figures show that in all but an insignificant proportion of these negotiations it has been as much or more to the advantage of the borrower to borrow the farm or home as it has been to the benefit of the lender in securing interest on the loan. The advantage is mutual, but distinctly greater on the part of the borrower, who has been enabled to become the owner of a homestead and the improvements thereon at lessening rates of interest throughout this period.

In proof of these benefits the following facts are deduced from Bulletin 63 of "Farms and Homes." Of the money borrowed on mortgage, 77.38 per cent was borrowed for the purchase or improvement of the land. Add the sums borrowed for durable personal prop-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erty or capital, and we find that more than 86 per cent of the money borrowed was expended in the purchase or improvement of land or for durable capital used thereon. Of the money borrowed during this decade, 2.82 per cent was borrowed to meet farm or family expenses.

Again, one of the most startling facts disclosed by these statistics is that the total debt on acres and lots combined, which was outstanding January 1, 1890, amounted to 16.67 per cent of the true value of the real estate represented in these tables, encumbered and unencumbered. It being assumed that a mortgage debt would be safe up to two-thirds the value, it appears that the actual encumbrance might have been safely increased four times. At only one-third—a more conservative estimate—it could have been doubled.

In twenty-two States, of which a separate analysis has been made, only 32.09 per cent of the taxed acres are under any mortgage or encumbrance of any kind. Sixty-eight per cent were absolutely free on January 1, 1890. Kansas and Nebraska are the only States in which there is any considerable preponderance of mortgaged farms as compared with those which are free.

In twenty-two of the States—mostly the older and not the newer States—in which the data of farms and homes as distinct from acres and lots have been completely analyzed, and of which the statistics have been digested, it appears that 32.30 per cent of the farms are hired. These farms are almost wholly free of mortgage, and 67.70 per cent are owned by their occupants. Of those which are owned by occupants, 69.78 per cent are free of any mortgage whatever, and 30.22 per cent are under a mortgage. Taking 100 farms as an example of relative conditions, the data of those twenty-two States prove that 32 are hired, 47 are occupied by owners free of encumbrance, and only 21 are occupied by owners under a mortgage.

Of the farms owned which are subject to an encumbrance, the average value is $3,190; the average mortgage $1,130. There has been an increase in hired farms from 24.38 per cent in 1880 to 32.30 per cent in 1889, but the tendency toward hiring farms appears to be continuous and slowly increasing.

Among the twenty-two States specially dealt with are Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee, in which it is the common practice of colored farmers to hire their lands from the owners of the old plantations, or their successors, for a share of the product. An increasing number of blacks are becoming owners, but more in towns and cities than in the country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If we deduct these Southern States, the proportion of hired farms in the other nineteen States falls to 19.81 per cent of the whole number, ranging from 7.62 in Maine to 29.57 in Iowa.

Before dealing with the tenant system a final summary may be made on this valuation, and it is proved on a fair estimate that the mortgage on farms did not exceed 10 per cent upon the value of the land and the improvements thereon.

Thus far the mortgages upon acres have been dealt with as if they were the same as mortgages on farms. As yet no complete separation has been made, but I am permitted to make the following statement on the authority of the Census officials.

In Bulletin No. 63 a partial analysis is made of the specific mortgages on actual farms which are occupied by owners, apart from hired farms, and acres which are not strictly farms. Deductions from these figures, applied to the total mortgage on acres in the United States, would give the following result:

Total mortgage on acres in the whole country, Jan. 1, 1890..	$2,209,148,431
On farms occupied and worked by owners (estimated).....	$1,009,148,431
On hired farms and on acres not strictly farms	$1,200,000,000

The encumbrance on hired farms is believed to be very small. The value of all the 4,564,641 farms in the United States in 1890, including improvements, was $13,279,252,649. The estimated mortgage thereon, January 1, 1890, was $1,009,148,431, equal to 8 per cent, subject to the addition of a small amount on hired farms.

It has been stated that there is a manifest tendency to an increase in the proportion of hired farms in the older grain-growing States of the Mississippi Valley, which calls for explanation. The question arises, Does this mean the growth of a landlord-and-tenant system, as it is commonly understood? It did not form a part of the duty of the Census officials to investigate this subject, but of course this tendency attracted their attention, and while they may not rightly give any official opinion I am assured that their views are not inconsistent with the evidence that I have obtained from other sources upon this matter. I have put questions to various persons in the grain-growing States, who are in a position to know the facts,—persons connected with successful and solvent farm-mortgage companies, or chiefs of bureaus of statistics of labor, or collectors of statistical data relating to crops. All replies are of the same general tenor. The questions put to them were substantially as follows:

1. Does the increase in the number of hired farms indicate a ten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dency to the establishment of permanent relations of landlord and tenant such as are customary in Great Britain?

2. Does it indicate the concentration of land in fewer hands?

3. Does it indicate better methods of agriculture, or the reverse?

The summary of the replies to these questions may be given in the following terms: These lands have been taken up and settled mainly during the last fifty years by men of whom many are now living. These men have, as a rule, prospered. The larger portion of them or their descendants own their farms, and many possess other property. The conditions have changed from those which are pictured in the early life of Abraham Lincoln to the condition which farmers now enjoy. A part of the other property of such farmers in many instances consists of money lent on mortgage on lots or farms in their own or neighboring States. In 102 typical counties selected from all portions of the country for the purpose of a special investigation by the Census authorities, it was disclosed that 68.69 per cent of the mortgages incurred were held by citizens of the same States in which the mortgaged real estate is. Many of these prosperous farmers have retired to towns and cities in order to educate their children and to enjoy in their latter years some of the privileges of town life,—their early life having been passed in isolated places under very arduous conditions. In many cases their farms are let to their sons. In many other cases men who have not retired have leased a part of their farms to their children. In many others, again, those who have retired have let their farms to men formerly in their employ. A very small proportion are hired by farmers who have been unable to pay mortgages which have been foreclosed, who now lease the farms in the hope of recovery. There are great numbers of men who have served as hired men on farms, who have laid up their earnings, and who prefer to hire land in the neighborhood where they are known, and where they can have the benefit of schools and good surroundings, rather than to move away to take up new land on the outskirts of civilization.

The evidence is conclusive that the increase of hired farms does not imply the permanent establishment of the relations of landlord and tenant after the English fashion. It does not imply the concentration of land in fewer hands, but rather the reverse. It does imply better and more intelligent methods of agriculture, larger and more varied crops produced from lessening areas of land throughout the whole great grain-growing section. This change to more varied crops long since became the rule in the East when the wheat and the corn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the West began to press upon Eastern markets, as the cost of transportation was reduced.

In order to sustain these deductions I will give a little of the voluminous evidence derived from the questions put to the chiefs of bureaus of statistics and others, in several States, especially in those in which the question of farm mortgages has been investigated by the State authorities, both before and since the Census investigation.

The first effective analysis of farm mortgages which has ever come under my notice was made by Mr. A. H. Heath, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics of Michigan for the year 1888. He obtained the data for 58 per cent of all the farms of Michigan, numbering 90,803, assessed for $194,854,633. In a letter to me the Commissioner says that while the law of Michigan implies that the assessment is made upon the full value, it might well be assumed that the assessed value does not exceed 80 per cent of the true value. If, then, we raise the value of farms listed to a sum of which 80 per cent would be the assessed valuation, we get the following results:

Farms listed	90,803
Acreage	7,830,549
Average size of farm, acres	86¼
Average value per acre	$31
Average value of each farm, a little less than	$2,700
True value	$243,568,291

Out of 90,803 farmers, 43,079 stated that their farms were mortgaged. A few refused to reply. The greater part of the remainder stated that their farms were not mortgaged. The true value of the farms which were mortgaged, estimated to be about one-half the total number, was $100,000,000; the mortgage debt $37,500,000. Of the farms investigated, 31,570 were owned or occupied by men of foreign birth, the best by Americans. In answer to the question put to the foreign element, "Had they any money when they arrived in the State?" 8,067 answered "Yes," giving the sum of money in their possession at $4,633,188 in all; 23,503 answered, "No." From these data we reach the following conclusion:

Foreigners brought money into the State to the amount of	$4,633,188
The mortgage debt on these specific farms was	11,191,714
Making a total of	$15,824,902
The assessed value of these specific farms was	$52,537,871
The true value	65,672,333

It follows that these 31,570 foreigners, who came from Germany, Canada, England, Ireland, Holland, Scotland, and nearly every other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country in Europe, from the East Indies, Australia, Hayti, Mexico, and South America, had been enabled, by borrowing money on mortgage, to become possessed of real estate worth $50,000,000 more than the encumbrance and the cash brought in by themselves; and this estimate does not include the farm animals, tools, and furniture used upon the farm.

The principal Western indebtedness on mortgage is in and around Chicago, but there is one startling fact to which my attention has been called by Mr. Holmes. In the great urban region in and around New York city; in Kings, Queens, New York, Richmond, and Westchester counties, in the State of New York; and in the counties of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Monmouth, Passaic, and Union in the State of New Jersey,—the real-estate mortgage debt is $1,279,343,703. This amount is 21.25 per cent. of the whole real-estate mortgage debt of the United States. It is 51.04 per cent of the real-estate mortgage debt of what is commonly known as the West, extending from Ohio westward to Kansas and northward to the Dakotas, with its populous cities of Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Milwaukee, Omaha, St. Louis, and St. Paul. It is doubtless true that the value of the real estate in and about New York is far more than sufficient to sustain this indebtedness, yet it is an important fact to know where the indebtedness lies, and what is the relative burden contrasting the East with the West.

It will be remarked that the amount of the encumbrance in the eleven counties in and around the city of New York exceeds the amount of mortgages on all the farms of the United States.

A recent investigation of farm mortgages on behalf of the State of Michigan by the successor of Mr. Heath discloses the fact that since 1887 there has been a very considerable liquidation of mortgages, so that last year the mortgage indebtedness of the farms of Michigan was much less than it was five years before. These statistics, compiled on behalf of the State a little before and a little after the Census investigation, are wholly consistent with the facts developed by the Census.

The States of Minnesota and South Dakota may be taken as examples of a section in which wheat has been the so-called "money crop," or for many years the main dependence of the farmers for their cash receipts. For a long period in the State of Minnesota—a shorter period in Dakota, more recently settled—what is known as the "all-wheat" system of cultivation prevailed, corresponding to the "all-cotton" system of the South. In both sections this system has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given way to varied crops, grown in rotation under better conditions of cultivation, occupying a lessening area of land in proportion to the product. In Nebraska somewhat similar conditions formerly prevailed and are now giving way to varied crops. The Deputy Commissioner of Labor Statistics of Nebraska says:

"The single-crop system will soon be a thing of the past. . . . The farms are being put under better conditions of cultivation. . . . It is well known that, with diversified farming, foreclosures are less numerous. . . . The tendency to hire rather than to buy land is explained by the fact that, the public domain being about exhausted, young men are prevented from going further west to establish themselves. . . . Many retired farmers live in the towns upon the income of their property; others still live on their farms, loaning money on mortgage to their neighbors."

The Secretary of the State of South Dakota replies: "A certain amount of discrimination should be made in the separation of farm mortgages from a general mortgage upon acres;" explaining this by the statement that—

—"speculative tracts of acres are held under mortgage for prospective profits, generally given by a "boomer". . . . Mortgages upon improved farms, whether occupied by renters or owners, are productive of sufficient income to pay interest and taxes and a profit to the owner besides. . . . In the southern portion of the State, mixed farming with rotation of crops is the common practice. In the northern part the farmers largely adhere to raising wheat, flax, oats, and barley. . . . In that portion of the State where mixed farming prevails it is a rare thing to hear of a mortgage foreclosure, while in the all-wheat section many mortgages are being foreclosed."

Tenant farming is explained by the fact that—

—"many owners who have worked faithfully and hard fifteen or twenty years have accumulated a sufficient competence to permit them to remove to a neighboring town to better enjoy school and church facilities for themselves and children. Tenant farming is not an indication of the consolidation of farms into larger area."

As an illustration, the Secretary says:

"Our little town of Canton, with a population of 1,800, has at least fifty families of retired farmers, most of whom are living exclusively on the income of their farms, and I am safe in saying that this same condition is to be found in every town in southeastern Dakota."

In respect to loaning money to neighbors, the Secretary says, in November, 1893:

"Even in this Lincoln County, which was first settled some twenty-two years ago by people of every nationality, who came by team and took homesteads then fifty miles from railroad, at least one-half of them are worth from $10,000 to $20,000, and many of them are loaning on mortgage to their less fortunate neighbors."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In conclusion he says:

"While it is true that farming confined exclusively to small grain-raising has not been very profitable for the past three or four years, it is a fact that the farmers who have pursued mixed farming, raising cattle, hogs, sheep, corn, wheat, etc., are invariably prosperous and gradually getting well off. In our county I am safe in saying that not 2 per cent of farm mortgages made here have gone to foreclosure. This is a remarkable record when it is considered that but very few quarters have escaped a mortgage at one time or another since it was patented by the government."

The same testimony is given in the Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of Minnesota for 1892, by Mr. L. G. Powers, Commissioner, a most competent witness. Down to and including the year 1892 the foreclosures on mortgages were steadily diminishing with the adoption of varied and more intelligent methods of farming. Mr. Powers remarks that "legitimate business suffers in Minnesota but very little from the burden of mortgage indebtedness. The speculator is the one who has most ground for complaint at that burden." The acreage of assessed lands has increased faster than that of mortgage foreclosures, and the amount of foreclosure has relatively diminished. Dealing with certain typical counties he remarks:

"In 1881 there were 129 acres of assessed land to every acre sold on foreclosure; in 1891 141 acres. The acreage sold under foreclosure decreased 9.6 per cent, while the amount diminished 35 per cent. . . . The mortgage foreclosures in Minnesota on farm property have in the past ten years decreased relatively 35 per cent, and the general condition of the farmers as a whole has been improved to that same extent since the year 1880."

In a letter written to me in November, 1893, Mr. Powers ends his testimony with this remark:

"The figures of mortgage foreclosures for the present are 80 per cent better than ten years ago. The newer counties are thus, even with their greater burden of debt and foreclosure, better off than the most favored portion of the State ten years ago."

His explanation of a slight increase in the number of hired farms is the same as that given in respect to the newer States of Nebraska and Dakota.

Similar testimony has been received from private individuals; notably Mr. S. T. K. Prime, of Dwight, Illinois, whose system of crop-reporting gives him an intimate knowledge of the conditions in every section of the grain-growing States; and he cites two small towns in Illinois, in one of which he himself resides, where the number of retired farmers living on the income of their farms or mort-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gages is about in the same proportion as those given for the little town of Canton previously cited.

In view of the fact that the control and direction of the policy of this country has practically moved into the Mississippi Valley, and in view of the yet more important fact that the farmers are organizing with the intention of exercising a greater control over the financial policy of this country than they have heretofore, this analysis may have a profound significance. If the condition of the Western farmer had been consistent with the picture of oppression and wrong which has been presented by Populists and others, one might have cause to dread the change in the balance of power which is now in progress. But when one witnesses the picture of solid and substantial prosperity to which these mortgage statistics bear testimony, all fears of any dangerous or revolutionary changes, either in our monetary or our revenue systems, may be laid aside, unless the people of other sections are so unwise as to attempt to obstruct legislation which is not of a revolutionary quality, but which is consistent with a true and much-needed reform. In the event of such unwise obstruction to judicious changes now proposed, with any sectional ends in view, the movement of the Western farmers might become one that would pay little regard to vested rights or privileges, and which would be carried to its conclusion with a merciless power.[1]

EDWARD ATKINSON.

Further information on the subjects here treated of may be found by consulting: "Recent Economic Changes," by David A. Wells; "Report of the Finance Committee of the Senate on Prices and Wages for Fifty-two Years," compiled by Commissioner Carroll D. Wright; "Census Reports of Mortgages," compiled by George K. Holmes and John S. Lord; Reports of Bureaus of Statistics in many States, notably those of Minnesota, South Dakota, Michigan, and Illinois; "The Distribution of Products" and "Taxation and Work," by Edward Atkinson.

[1] All of the figures in this article that have been taken from the Census Tables of mortgage and farm and home proprietorship statistics have been verified by the Census Office, and also all computations in which these numbers only have been used; but of course this does not commit the Census Office to any opinion expressed in the article, nor to any inference or interpretation drawn from the statistics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DILATORY SENATE AND DEPRESSION IN TRADE.

CONFIDENCE returns with the veto of Bland's measure, but stagnation of business continues. It is reflected by an increasing accumulation of idle capital and rates of interest lower than ever prevailed in this country for so long a time. One removable impediment to prosperity is the uncertainty about the tariff bill. An examination of the present situation of leading industries, as given below, demonstrates that the delay of proper legislation is a chief cause of the depression.

Iron and steel.—In 1893 there were 74 anthracite furnaces in blast, producing 34,773 tons weekly; and in 1894 there are but 32 furnaces in blast, producing 16,018 tons weekly. Prices ruled as follows:

	March, 1893.	March, 1894.
Bessemer iron ore in Cleveland.....	$4.00 to $4.25	$2.50 to $2.75 per ton.
Bar iron " New York.....	1.80	1.25 " 100 lbs.
Cotton ties " "	.80 " .90	.55 " .60 " 45 "
Steel beams for build'gs, in New York	2.00 to 2.25	1.30 " 1.50 per 100 lbs.
Bessemer pig iron " Pittsburg	14.00	10.00 " ton.
Steel billets " "	23.00	15.00 " "

Importations would be impossible at present values, even if duties were entirely abolished; for prices in some cases are lower here than in Europe, as is shown by a recent sale of 10,000 kegs of nails for export to Australia by way of England. Had they not been cheaper here, these goods would have been purchased in Great Britain. Negotiations are pending for the export of Southern bar iron from Birmingham, Alabama, by way of London to China.

Cotton and cottons.—A year ago the middling staple sold at $8\frac{5}{8}$ cents per pound, against $7\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound to-day. Print cloth was worth $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents per yard, or $26\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound, last year; and is worth $2\frac{13}{16}$ cents per yard, or $19\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, now. Cotton goods for export have declined about 15 per cent. The reduction in prices of better cottons is insignificant; the average production of all kinds has been curtailed fully 25 per cent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wool and woollens.—The following shows the change of prices:

		March, 1893.	March, 1894.
Our best scoured Montana wool brought, per lb.	In New York or Boston	55 cents	35 cents
Our best washed X and XX Ohio fleece brought		30 "	21 "

Only 25 per cent of our looms are running, and those on half time; of the usual quantity of woollen goods about one-tenth is now produced. This may explain why the average decline of prices does not exceed 15 per cent.

Absence of demand has been disastrous to cordage, so as to cripple that industry; prices declined over 30 per cent, and not more than half the usual quantity is produced. Of goods not directly influenced by legislation, the production of leather has been curtailed 35 per cent; that of rubber goods, 40 per cent.

It is evident that the depression is greater in those articles that are affected by the tariff, while luxuries have become unsalable. But every interest suffers. Throughout the country railroads have reduced expenses and discharged men, so that they retain barely enough for the smaller number of passengers and quantity of freight which they carry. The warehouses of our merchants are deserted; their pay-rolls have been curtailed. Words fail to express the extent of the depression. Even private schools are closing, because parents can no longer pay for the tuition of their children; to escape starvation, artists would offer brush and chisel to paint houses and decorate gravestones respectively; but building is restricted, and economy has reached the churchyard. Fortunately the calls on charity by the unemployed were met in a liberal spirit. The low prices at which agricultural products must be sold have contributed to the depression. Wheat lately brought here 60 cents a bushel,—a lower price than has ever been known. But we may expect a recurrence of seasons when agriculture will be equally unprofitable; it is certain that in the foreign markets for cereals we will meet an increasing competition from Argentina and other new sources of supply. Yet low prices for agricultural products alone cannot account for the continued depression.

To retain our prominence among mercantile nations, a larger export of our manufactures is desirable. Hard times have taught our fabricants to economize so as to enable them to sell at ruling prices the few goods they can dispose of. When they can obtain material to better advantage, they will be better equipped to compete

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in other markets. That large quantities of moquette carpets could recently be sent to England and Canada shows what we can already accomplish, although the transactions were facilitated by a liberal drawback for the wool the goods contained.

England's real prosperity began when she discarded protection; exports increased from $237,000,000 in 1842 to $1,642,000,000 in 1890; the wealth of the country increased in that period more than 150 per cent, and the consumption of leading articles of food 500 per cent *per capita*. The efficiency of labor increased wonderfully. In 1880, when the English spinner earned £44 4*s*. a year, the cost of labor in a pound of yarn was 1*s*. 9*d*., about one-third of what it cost at the time of protection, when the same operator earned a great deal less. Our labor is already more efficient; for the American weaver attends to six or eight looms, the British to three or four, and the German to two or three; an advantage of which our manufacturers will know how to avail themselves as soon as the markets of the world for materials are opened to them. The value of skilled labor increases according to the extent to which it can be made available. The prosperity of our manufacturers will become permanent when their sales are no longer confined to our country and orders can be obtained from other markets when this one fails. As soon as a new tariff passes, we may look for some immediate improvement. Stocks of merchandise are low, and will be in urgent demand when buyers no longer fear that they may depreciate on their hands over-night. Party politics should be forgotten in the consideration of this measure, when it is so evident that a postponement of the same means the continuance of this stagnation.

The Democrats have been defeated at the recent elections, not because reform is considered undesirable, but because people are losing confidence that the ruling party can dispose of the question. It will be agitated as much after the fall election as it has been and is now, if it should not be decided previously. The failure to act now would be a disaster to the country, for the depression becomes more intense the longer it continues. If we should have to bear it another winter, we may see bread-riots in more cities than one; suffering will become terrible. The burden of the blame will fall on obstructionist legislators, of whatever party they may be. The statesman who will relieve us from the incubus of this uncertainty will render the greatest service of the time to us and our posterity.

LOUIS WINDMÜLLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STABILITY OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

It is difficult for Americans, brought up amid institutions which are supposed to be founded in every branch upon the popular will, and with national principles of government which are constantly eulogized as the most democratic in the world, to comprehend the position of the British House of Lords, either in its power or in its weakness. The British aristocracy has no counterpart in the United States, and the republican spirit of the New World naturally finds itself out of sympathy with an institution and a class which together constitute the products of an ancient civilization; the result of eight hundred years' development along certain social and political lines; the present source of an influence strong enough to withstand the ambition of England's greatest politician, and of a power which has successfully withstood the repeated attacks of its Radical enemies since the memorable battle over the Reform Bill of 1832.

A study of British history alone affords the key to the peculiar commingling of aristocracy and democracy which is visible in the present Constitution and national life of the United Kingdom. It shows—what is too often overlooked—that the House of Lords, since the time of the Norman Conquest, has frequently stood for the people and for popular rights and liberties against the power of the monarchy and the tyrannical spirit of a lawless age. It was the Peers who protected John Wycliffe and his preaching friars, and helped to lay the foundation for modern liberty of conscience and worship. It was the Barons who won from King John at Runnymede the charter of British political freedom and constitutional government. It was the House of Lords which took the chief part in driving King James from the throne, thus inaugurating the Protestant succession, and destroying by that act the theory of the divine right of kings. It was undoubtedly the aristocracy of England and Scotland which in rude ages, and amid more or less barbarous surroundings, cultivated literature and art, kept alive the light of the sciences, and promoted the spread of knowledge, while practising the duties of a wide and generous hospitality and administering a rough and ready justice in times when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legal redress and royal aid were alike difficult, if not impossible, to obtain.

The British Upper House, therefore, represents a great historic past, in which it has done much good work, and in which it has always held a dignified and powerful position. The wars of England, Scotland, and, in a lesser degree, of Ireland, are replete with the deeds of the nobles, and are made up largely of their struggles either for power at home or glory abroad. They have stood for the honor of their country upon many a European and world-wide battle-field, and have carried the British flag into the four corners of the earth. For centuries this prestige has been gathering around the peerage of Great Britain, and in a country where Westminster Abbey is considered one of its greatest possessions, and the ancient Cathedrals are encircled with a halo of veneration, it is not difficult to appreciate this as one of the sources of aristocratic strength. Gradually, too, the House of Lords, though supposed to be almost exclusively representative of the aristocratic and land-owning class of the community, has been strengthening itself in other directions, and, by means of the system which constantly infuses new life and intellect into its membership through fresh peerage creations, has included among its supporters many of the most important financial and commercial interests of the country. And as Lord Brougham points out in his "Political Philosophy:"

> "Its veto upon all the measures that pass the Commons; the weight derived from its judicial functions; its general superiority in the capacity and learning required for excelling in debate; its more calm deliberation on all questions, unbiassed by mob clamor; its more statesmanlike views of both foreign and domestic policy,—give the Upper House an extraordinary influence on all questions of national concernment."

We may be unable to agree with everything in this extract, and indeed the facts are against some of the statements, but it is of value as coming from a brilliant Liberal who was a member of Lord Grey's government when it proposed to utterly swamp the House of Lords by the creation of enough peers to pass the first great Reform Bill. It is, however, this faculty of assimilating opponents and opposing influences which makes the Upper House so strong while it appears to be so weak. Mr. Gladstone has created peers by the hundred, and the result has been that keen Radical members of the Commons, like Robert Lowe; members of old-time Whig families and of recent Liberal ministries, like Lord Carlingford, Lord Northbrook, Lord Selbourne, Lord Cowper, Lord Stalbridge, and many more, have practi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cally affiliated themselves with the party which believes the maintenance of old institutions and aristocratic influence to be compatible with the existence of a free democracy. Over a hundred Liberal peers, most of whom had served their apprenticeship to public life under his leadership in the House of Commons, voted against the Premier upon the question of Home Rule; and out of 419 who attended upon that historic occasion, only 41 could be got to support the party to which so many had belonged for a lifetime.

The cause for this lies below the surface, and constitutes the basis of the peculiar power wielded by the House of Lords. The Chamber is composed at present of 555 members, of whom 6 are members of the royal family (who, of course, never vote upon political questions), 298 barons, 114 earls, 22 marquises, 20 dukes, 26 bishops and archbishops (the lords spiritual), 16 Scotch representative peers, and 28 Irish representative peers. The last-mentioned members are elected by the Scotch and Irish peers who still remain from the creations made before the Union. A few life peers are also created from time to time, from among the most eminent legal lights of the day, who embody in practice the power, which still rests nominally with the Upper House, of acting as a national law court of last appeal. They are known as Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, and receive a salary of £5,000 a year for services which are undoubtedly of great value.

The House of Lords is not in itself a class; it is merely representative of various classes which are intertwined with the every-day national life of England. And herein lies the power of the British Upper House. The prestige of its members has been already referred to, and the mere list comprises titles eminent in every branch of national achievement for centuries past. It has its roots in every parish, and is, or has been, associated with every phase of the nation's development. But not by virtue of merely possessing titles. "The greater part of the English nobility," says Walter Savage Landor, "have neither power nor title. Even those who are noble by right of possession, the hereditary lords of manors with large estates attached to them, claim no titles at home or abroad." In European countries these men would all have figurehead designations, and go—as in France—to swell a list of a hundred thousand "nobles." But in the whole United Kingdom there are only 630 peers, and nearly a hundred of these have no place in the Upper House. Naturally, however, their influence is increased in proportion to their fewness in numbers and the largeness of the class which they really represent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of such a class are families like the Dymokes, the Derings, the Scropes, the Leghs, the Aclands, and many more; possessed of magnificent estates and mansions which even the ducal families of Devonshire or Norfolk might be proud to own. A foreigner visiting these houses—an American returning for a time to the home of his ancestors—would be able to detect no distinct differences between the life and surroundings at these houses of untitled gentlemen and those visible at the mansion of a great nobleman—unless it were the absence of a coronet upon the spoons and plates.

Titled or untitled, peers or commoners, the heads of these families all over the United Kingdom fulfil the same public offices and duties, and constitute a life which is permeated with the same sense of an immemorial past and of an hereditary dignity and honor which must be conserved and handed down to future generations. It is this aristocracy which for centuries has led public opinion, enforced public order, administered public money, given candidates to constituencies and clergymen to parishes, patronized the arts, and been the pioneer of progressive agriculture. Pictures of its members adorn the county buildings, their memorials cover the walls of churches, and monuments occupy as much space as do the congregations. Their titles are derived from the villages or towns, and the country squire and parson are as much a part of the aristocracy as is the peer or the great county gentleman. Perhaps, however, the most important source of the influence wielded by the aristocracy of England is its facility for widening its bounds and taking in new elements of strength. Aristocracies and oligarchies of old perished as much from jealous preservation of privileges among a few, and refusal to mix with the people, as from any other cause. In England, however, the younger scions of a noble family, whether that nobility be derived from birth or title or estate, often marry into other classes, and more and more frequently intermingle with the mercantile and commercial elements of the national life.

But, instead of losing caste and their identity and feelings by so doing, the results seem to indicate a process by which aristocratic influence is extended through the continuous admission of new members and recruits to its ranks. When this process is combined with the equally common spectacle of commercial magnates and financiers who have risen upon the bank or beer to a position in which they are able to found aristocratic families or ally themselves with the peerage through marriage or by creation, we see how greatly the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

element in question is strengthened. When Warren Hastings proclaimed, as the ambition of his life, the recovery of the ancient manor of Daylesford, which had gone out of his family through misfortune, eventual success came to him as almost a balm for national ingratitude, and as infinitely preferable to any peerage. This indicated the strength of family pride. When Nelson considered a peerage full reward for his great services, it showed the prestige which surrounds the House of Lords. When a Rothschild is glad to enter its precincts, and a Bass or Guinness to accept titles, it proves the power which a House capable of obtaining such influential recruits must possess. The land, which was at one time its all-sufficient basis, has called the financial and commercial interests of the country to its aid, and in a thousand ways is strengthening its hold upon other classes and sections, and welding them into the great aristocratic body which constitutes the support of the Upper House.

But family pride, wealth, the appreciation of honors bestowed and worn, and the possession of landed estates, would hardly be a sufficient basis for the security of the structure, if the much-discussed, much-abused, and little-understood hereditary principle were taken away. There is no doubt that the influence of this hereditary quality possessed by the House of Lords is underestimated in America. Titles of various kinds are well understood and appreciated throughout the Republic, but the idea of descent is generally condemned. Yet the view held by those who support the principle in England is simple and forceful. Its instability in a new country is admitted, but its applicability to Great Britain, and especially England, is stoutly maintained. Its strength is found there in the wide diffusion of families possessed, through inheritance, of a great similarity in estates, fortunes, education, pursuits, and social customs. Intermarriage maintains this similarity, while there is sufficient accretion of outsiders to keep up the general vitality and vigor of the aristocratic class. As already pointed out, these families impress their influence in every direction, and the Church, the Bar and Bench, the Army and Navy are recruited largely from their ranks. Whether noble in name or not, they have formed a sort of hereditary governing body in England for centuries. Where a leader has risen from the ranks, like Disraeli, he has been incorporated; but usually, and with few exceptions, British statesmen have belonged to this class from the first. Bright and Cobden and Gladstone may be considered among the exceptions, but the latter was the brother of a baronet, allied himself through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marriage with the daughter of a baronet, and has made Hawarden Castle a household name. These may seem trivial details, but they show that the great Radical leader of the age has always been more or less bound up with the very aristocratic class whose representatives in the House of Lords he so lately and vigorously attacked. To some degree he escaped from its influences, but his early Toryism and even certain later convictions show that he never entirely severed himself from the tendencies of an aristocratic environment. And this fact alone proves the power of the class and the influence of hereditary surroundings. But, after all, environment is the very essence of the principle. In the earlier history of England, the landed aristocracy were the only class which combined wealth and leisure, and were therefore free to devote themselves to the various arts of government and that cultivation of learning and literature with which the development of higher politics is so intimately allied. As time passed on, and despite change in every other direction, the inherited conditions of aristocratic life served to produce, not alone the will to govern, but the character and capacity which successfully perpetuated the power in the hands of a single class. As the authority and governing influence of the monarch were undermined—largely by aristocratic efforts,—the power of the aristocracy grew, whether under the name of Whig or Tory. The ministerial authority vested in the Duke of Wellington or Lord Lyndhurst passed into the reforming hands of Earl Grey or Lord John Russell; but none the less was the government of the country an aristocratic one, and such it remained through the régimes of Palmerston or Derby, Beaconsfield, Gladstone, or Salisbury. Whether the Cabinet was Liberal or Conservative, the bulk of its members were peers, and are so to-day, while all the diatribes of a Labouchere cannot at the present time even trouble the mind of the Liberal leader who has to be chosen by his party from the aristocracy and the House of Lords itself.

The influence which has largely created this governing body, and maintained the Upper House against the fiercest possible onslaughts, is unquestionably that of heredity. This cannot, perhaps, be stated in an individual sense, although families such as the Derbys, Lansdownes, Salisburys, Carnarvons, and Carlisles would seem to prove the point; but it may be asserted in the general form of noting an environment—family, social, political, personal, and, above all, educational—which emphatically conduces to fitness for governing a mixed community. The effect of these surroundings and opportunities has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

naturally developed suitability where it existed: afforded ample opening for public life where it was desired; filled the House of Commons with many representatives of the aristocracy; fostered a wide experience of men and things, of countries and constitutions, of people and principles, through facilities for travel and intercourse; and produced those qualities of firmness and confidence in managing men which has been exemplified in British diplomacy and statesmanship upon a thousand occasions, from the inexperienced but wonderfully capable administration of Lord Canning or Lord Mayo in India, to the very latest illustration of Lord Dufferin's ability in Paris.

And the hereditary principle has attached to the present system every man who is ambitious to found a family name or send down to posterity a family estate; every man with social aspirations; and the many who still regard sentimental considerations and do not like the onward march of democracy. In England this hereditary consideration in connection with the House of Lords is very important, because of the feeling that if that body were once swept away—the royal veto being practically a dead letter—there would be no safeguard against demagogic inroads upon property and wealth, investments and finance. And the ensuing uncertainty would be a danger which the great majority of Englishmen would hesitate to risk. In a word, a genuine party proposal to abolish the House of Lords would disrupt the Liberal party once more; and that, Lord Rosebery will no more venture, or indeed desire, than Lord Salisbury would like to bring in a régime of revolution or robbery:

> "Down with princes, down with peoples,
> Down with churches, down with steeples;
> Down with love and down with marriage,
> Down with all who keep a carriage;
> Down with lord and down with lady,
> Up with everything that's shady."

To sum up the strength of the House of Lords, therefore, it may be said to base its claims for a share of the government of the country upon being representative of the most thoroughly educated class in the community; upon possessing among the bulk of its members an hereditary training for political life and an intimate connection with all the great present interests of the country, through fresh peerage creations and the influx of the ablest men of every stamp to its ranks; upon having in its existing membership 169 peers who have had practical training as members of the House of Commons, and 114

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peers who have served in offices of state or as governors of colonies, as judges, ambassadors, or members of the Civil Service in other high departments; upon possessing 126 peers who are members of the County Councils in England or Wales, and upward of 300 peers who are justices of the peace in their native counties and possessed of more or less practical knowledge of an important branch of judicial procedure. Its supporters—granting of course the necessity of a Second Chamber—believe that the House of Lords stands for the protection of true democracy against the demagogue, as it has already stood for the protection of the people against the despot. They believe that it will always avert the modern danger of one-man rule, which no doubt would have been the result of the Grand Old Man's career had he not encountered a check; and finally they believe with Lord Beaconsfield, in his famous speech upon Conservative principles in 1872, that—

—"an English gentleman—born to business, managing his own estate, administering the affairs of his county, mixing with all classes of his fellow-men, now in the hunting-field, now in the railway direction, unaffected, unostentatious, proud of his ancestors if they have contributed to the greatness of our common country—is on the whole more likely to form a senator agreeable to English opinion and English taste than any substitute which has yet been produced."

This, then, is a necessarily brief and inadequate sketch of some of the sources of strength possessed by the British House of Lords, which a few Radicals propose to abolish, and which Lord Rosebery undoubtedly intends to reform. There are darker shades to the picture, and almost any one can fill them in. Still, most of the objections and denunciations which we so often hear on this side of the Atlantic permit of answers more or less strong, as the case may be. Responsibility is perhaps the principal charge. But, after all, the Lords are amenable to public opinion, even though they be not elected by popular vote; and they are certainly responsible to the whole great order which they represent; to the landed interests; to the Established Church. They hold in their hands the safety of the whole social fabric of England, and know full well, by education and training, that the system of carefully elaborated precedents and checks known as the British Constitution will fall to pieces if they are guilty of rashness or show a lack of what they consider patriotism. The admission of "black sheep" is an objection to the hereditary principle; but it is one easily removable, and at most those who have dishonored the British peerage are few in number and certainly not in excess of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those who reflect discredit upon the House of Commons so far as comparative numbers are concerned. That the Upper House checks and delays legislation is unquestionably true, but has not the voice of England so far always been upon its side when the question at issue has been finally submitted to the electorate?

Upon all these points the British Conservative claims to have the best of the argument with an American. Admitting the necessity of a Second Chamber, despite the Abbé Sièyes' famous epigram that, "if it dissents from the First, it is mischievous; if it agrees, it is superfluous," he will assert his preference for a House of Peers over a House of Millionaires; an aristocracy of blood over an aristocracy of boodle. And the American of to-day can hardly speak with the same pride of his Upper House as could his father of the Chamber in which Clay and Webster, Calhoun and Sumner fought the battles of intellectual and oratorical giants. As Sir Henry Sumner Maine says in one of his works, the current objections to the House of Lords are mainly generalities. The history of landed property in great masses is by no means ended in England—it has only begun in America. It is by no means sure that the hereditary principle is as unpopular as is generally supposed: the career of Lord Rosebery illustrates this statement. And it is equally doubtful if the age of aristocratic ascendency is gone forever. Such a consummation may be wished for, and it may be inevitable, but it is certainly not yet. The reign of peace on earth and good will among men, we can hope is coming, but it is not yet here, and perfect national equality of conditions seems as far away as it ever was, despite the growth of democracy and popular government. Even in the United States the development of an aristocracy of money and monopoly, of fashion and custom, is one of the features of the time. And Americans, in denouncing the House of Lords, with all its imperfections freely admitted, can still afford to remember that their own Congress affirmed and maintained for long years the right of human slavery, and that if the Lords for a while opposed Roman Catholic emancipation, the Duke of Wellington finally granted it, and long before the United States Senate had made it a penal offence to harbor a fugitive from the slave-owner. But this aside.

Proposals are once more afoot for vigorous action against the Lords; for a root-and-branch reform. It is not the first occasion that a storm of this kind has arisen and threats have been freely bandied about. In 1884, when the Upper House refused to pass the Franchise

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bill without a measure of redistribution of seats, or at least a reasonable assurance that such a measure would follow, the political air was fairly ablaze with Radical denunciation. Huge processions paraded the streets of London; monster meetings were held in parks and public places; great meetings indoors, and overflow meetings in the streets. An onlooker would have supposed the whole country had risen against the Lords. Yet in a short time a compromise was effected by which the Upper House practically gained its point, and in little over a year the agitation was forgotten and the Tories themselves were in power. So, when the Home Rule Bill was rejected, the agitation was but a flash in the pan, and such may again be the case. In an almost forgotten period Daniel O'Connell stumped the country against the Lords, as did Sir Charles Dilke twenty odd years ago against the monarchy. Let Mr. Labouchere try his hand at a similar campaign if he really wants to destroy the order from which "Truth," with its somewhat parasitical pages and tuft-hunting propensities, gets so much patronage.

But whether great or little changes are to be made depends very much upon Lord Rosebery and his ability to retain office. That he favors reform in minor matters is unquestionable, and that he would like to see the exclusion of "black sheep," the limitation of membership, and the inclusion of a number of life peers, is probable, while his references to his own position indicate a desire to permit peers to choose which House they shall sit in—if election offers for the Commons. But it must not be supposed that Lord Rosebery will do anything to injure the order to which he belongs—the aristocracy, of which the House of Lords is only a small portion. His entire political career and every speech which he has delivered prove the desire to reform and improve, not to reform and destroy. And the very admission of peers to the Lower House would serve to increase the general influence of the aristocracy. It is possible, indeed, that Lord Salisbury and the Tories would not greatly oppose proposals based on the above outline. What they would bitterly contest is the policy described by the latter leader in December, 1880, as voiced by "persons among us who maintain that it is the duty of the House of Lords to act as the pale shadow of the House of Commons, and to repeat in a feeble echo all that that House may decide to pass."

Logically, of course, Lord Salisbury would be correct in such opposition. If the Lords are never to differ from the Commons, of what use is it for them to deliberate? If they become degraded to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere delegates and echoes of another Chamber; if their dignity is to be compromised and authority lost, the enemies of the Upper House will have won the day, and it might as well be abolished at once. But claims in this direction seem to have moderated very much since the memorable day when Mr. Gladstone threw down the gauntlet, and Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Labouchere so joyfully supported his action. The Duke of Devonshire already compares his one-time leader's last effort to the great discharge of artillery which is made in order that amid the confusion and excitement a general may withdraw his forces from a dangerous position.

The chief Liberal organs are not following Labouchere's lead, but with a few exceptions seem more inclined to laugh at him. The recognized party organ—the "Daily News"—hints very strongly at a plan already referred to, and which it declares is supported by Mr. Morley and is "understood to have been supported by Lord Rosebery himself," for the providing, by act of Parliament, that any peer may relinquish his seat in the House of Lords and become a candidate for the Commons. It is a marvel that the added power thus given the aristocracy as a whole is not considered.

But in the long run common-sense will probably prevail, and recognition be given to the fact that, where two Chambers exist, and both are elective, conflicts of authority must be, have been, and are to-day more numerous and bitter than has ever been the case between the Lords and the Commons; and that, in a country where the Constitution and the social system is such a complex combination of aristocracy and democracy, the best possible arrangement is one by which an hereditary Chamber and an elective House can agree to submit their differences to the crucible of mutual consultation and compromise.

J. Castell Hopkins.

Toronto, Canada.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHILD-STUDY: A TEACHER'S RECORD OF HER PUPILS.

In the fall of 1884 there was organized in Brooklyn a little school, christened by one of its patrons "The Froebel Academy." The little academy grew out of the demand of some of the citizens of up-town Brooklyn for a school in their own neighborhood in which children from the kindergarten age to twelve years could receive the advantages of the more improved methods of instruction. It was my privilege to organize this work. With a Board of Trustees representing a very high degree of intelligence on educational subjects, and with none of the inherited limitations of an established school, we found ourselves in an atmosphere of freedom highly stimulating to best thought and highest purpose.

In the first year, work in child-observation was begun. It had for its object a more thorough and systematic knowledge of the child, in order that efforts for his best development might be more effective and successful. The method was simple in the extreme. The teachers met to review in order each child separately,—to say what were his best possibilities and his greatest needs, and to ask how the first should be realized and the last satisfied. At the close of the year the list was again reviewed, and the development of each child was carefully noted. A quotation from the record of this work will suggest its character:

(1) A persistent, careful worker; inclined to be nervous and impatient; a leader with a good influence generally. *Second Entry.*—Work in class not satisfactory; want of steadiness and persistence; influence bad, tendency to pettiness and gossip.

(2) A close observer of nature; his general work greatly wanting in method and mechanical power; a fine, sensitive, pure character, exerting a quiet but very good influence. *Second Entry.*—Improvement for the year marked, especially in method of work; less dreamy than last year; influence excellent.

(3) A leader always; clear comprehension, original and inventive; wonderful memory; influence usually good. *Second Entry.*—Has done an excellent year's work; a little lacking in moral courage; a child who needs very careful oversight.

(4) A bright, good, ambitious worker with a danger in the direction of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

physical weakness, *Second Entry.*—Physical and nervous conditions very bad, —must be guarded morally.

(5) Indolent, but capable; slovenly in the carriage of his body. *Second Entry.*—Very indolent; notwithstanding a good mind he does but indifferent work; given to untruthfulness.

A high sense of honor pervaded this work. The home was not called in question. The child was taken as he was, and the problem as to how he could best develop his own powers occupied our thought. The record was for the teachers only. An admirable opportunity was lost here, for there was organized in that first year a society of women—the mothers of our children—whose purpose was mainly that of intelligently uniting the interests of the school and the home. Had the work been frankly shared with them, its value to all interested must have been much greater. No thoughtful teacher can long continue a systematic observation of the life and growth of a child, without concluding that he is largely influenced by three powerful agents—the home, the school, and the neighborhood. Too often some of these three influences are in conflict, with the result that the child is always the loser. Given intelligent co-operation between the first two, the third is largely controlled; but not until this is done can there be any least hope of making the harmonious education of the child a comparatively certain thing.

As I recall the results of this work I see that they were twofold, for it affected both the children and the teachers. The even development of the child was less accidental as efforts for him became more co-operative. The undeveloped power that we had agreed that a boy possessed found by more united effort increased opportunity for activity; and bad mental habits received more consistent check. The work of one teacher was not undone by another because of ignorance of his purposes for the child. The teacher shared more of the parent's feeling for the child, and human interest and sympathy increased. The subject-matter of the lesson no longer held the leading place in thought; for the teacher had a living subject, and lessons became a means, not an end. The work grew in interest; freedom was given for individual growth; routine was banished; and something of the home atmosphere entered with the home feeling.

Seven years have passed, but these children live in my mind as if I had parted with them yesterday. Clearly defined and individualized they hold their place in memory as no other children have done, and I feel that, through all the intervening changes, I know them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to-day, as an artist, who has clearly seen the strongly blocked outlines of the unfinished statue, recognizes it at once, though many finishing strokes have been added by other hands.

Last year this work was applied in a somewhat modified form in the Practice Department of the State Normal School at Platteville, Wisconsin. Meetings are held quarterly, attended by the pupil-teachers of the class in review, and by the department principal. The growth and work of each child is carefully reviewed and recorded. First place is given to the young teachers in the discussion. Their insight into child mind is a good test of their native power in this direction and of the faithfulness of their work. I copy from this present record:

(1) *October 1.*—Age 6 years; bright, but lacks continuity and power of concentration; does not seem to think at all in number work. *November 15.*—Perceptive powers very active, but no power of concentration; nothing is assimilated; his teachers are working faithfully to gain better habits of attention. *January 13.*—Marked improvement; a good growth in attention and concentration; more thoughtful in his bearing; memory much improved. *March 8.*—Has been absent and lost ground; his work as a rule is good. *May 23.*—Is growing beautifully; inclined to distrust himself; a helpful child, sympathetic, interested in others.

(2) *October 1.*—Age 8 years; good mind; sensitive, reticent, sometimes covers this with an air of bravado; a careless worker. *January 17.*—Improved habits in work, in conduct, and in thought; realizing his possibilities rapidly. *March 18.*—Has been doing good, even work; much interested in natural science. *May 24.*—Not working up to the level of his power; careless about form; all hand-work poorly done; frequent lapses in attention; a child who lives in a world of his own.

(3) *October 1.*—Age 10 years; heavy-eyed; not well; hearing and sight slightly defective; wanting in self-trust. *January 9.*—Marked improvement; very uneven in his work; inclined to be self-distrustful. *March 8.*—Marked improvement; still self-distrustful and uneven; influence not always good. *May 23.*—Progress for the year excellent; has gained in power to think; much improved in bearing; interested in the work of others; gaining the respect of the class; still wanting in self-trust.

(4) *October 12.*—Age 10; dreamy and absent-minded; a good thinker when aroused; he has never done his best; does not know what real work is. *January 15.*—Excellent improvement; more at one with his class; less absent-minded and listless; a child with a good mind but with irregular mental habits; inclined to jump at conclusions. *March 22.*—He has made little gain during the last quarter; he is still inclined to inattention and listlessness. *May 24.*—Work still uneven, though much improved; he observes well, reasons well; better habits of attention; improved bearing.

(5) *October 13.*—Age 11 years; a child of unusual beauty in face and form; excellent possibilities in mind and character; habits of attention rather poor; wanting in self-trust. *January 21.*—Excellent progress; a gain in self-trust; always tries. *March 22.*—Shows an inclination to be fussy over little things; a danger toward selfishness; shows the symptoms of the indulged child; general

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work good. *May 4.*—Good work; inclined to be a little languid sometimes; a danger toward self-indulgence.

(6) *October 1.*—Age 12; excellent powers; good development so far; a quiet, thoughtful boy, exercising a good influence. *January 23.*—Inclined to be somewhat uneven in his work; a child who is quite easily influenced. *March 23.*—Improved, but not yet doing his best; does not know how to do even every-day work; does not sufficiently respect his work. *May 25.*—Manly; very amiable in character; very thoughtful; he never works hard; still lacks purpose in work; improving slowly.

(7) *October 20.*—Age 15 years. Good natural ability, with good general knowledge; an observing mind; thoughtless in manner; always truthful. *January 25.*—Has improved in work, but has not improved in self-control; inclined to try for leadership among his boy companions. *March 24.*—No moral growth; inclined to think too well of himself; marked symptoms of forwardness and conceit.

Modern science asks that the subject be studied in the object. Slowly modern education is recognizing that its subject is not learning, but the learner; slowly it is awaking to the fact that this learner is not to be studied in the books alone, but in his own proper person, in his own rightful place, to be known as he is. The individuality of the child is now recognized as something to be carefully preserved and developed. That he shall come into possession of his own best powers, that his personality shall find freedom for expression and all-round growth, is for him a matter of vital importance. To meet this need the school must give the child liberty to do his own thinking. Such liberty is doubtless one of the demands of modern education, but it can by no means be given indiscriminately. On the contrary, it must be constantly readjusted to suit the growing power of the individual or class, to use it well.

In this view of the child as an independent entity, the teacher necessarily becomes and remains a student. Preconceived theory must often be abandoned, and routine and dogma banished, while he learns from the patient observation of the lives of children what are the needs of those lives and what conditions give happiest, most truly fortunate development. Everything, then, that helps the young teacher to become a practical daily student of child-nature is for him the best possible training in the science and art of education. This work was taken up for the benefit of the child only, but it has proved itself of great value to the pupil-teachers.

Doubtless one of the evils of practice-work is its tendency to induce self-consciousness on the part of the teacher: his careful training in method exposes him to the danger of fixing his thought on the subject to the exclusion of the child. All this is opposed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that sympathetic relation between teacher and child which characterizes all best teaching. But I believe that the observation of children has helped to concentrate the thought of the young teacher on its legitimate object—the child. It has tended to form the habit of working for the child as an individual, and it renders such work more intelligent and effective.

Simple as the record is, it affords material for answering many questions respecting the character and growth of children. It is a constant reminder of the effect, good or bad, of the school. It promises in time to afford an interesting history of the development of individual children, a history that will doubtless be valuable in answering questions as to the flexibility of the child-mind and character, as to his vast possibilities for growth or retrogression. It suggests that the best growth is attended with its own dangers; that one-sided development is easy and almost sure to attend defective conditions; that the complex child-nature requires a very whole life to supply its needs. The intellectual stimulus is not enough; but active participation in the common life of all, sympathetic interest in nature and in the activities and interests of the industrial and social world,—all are needed to secure the beautiful all-sided growth of a little child.

This plan will be adopted and adapted by some of the public schools in the following manner: Teachers in the various grades will make a record of those children who for any reason stand out most conspicuously in their classes. These records will be given to the superintendent and kept from year to year. The plan meets the obvious difficulty of dealing with large numbers in the public schools, and it renders character-study necessary in those marked cases with which teachers must deal directly and individually.

MARY E. LAING.

In connection with this subject the reader may refer to the following recent articles in THE FORUM: "Child-Study: the Basis of Exact Education," by President G. Stanley Hall, December, 1893 (Vol. 16, p. 429); "Child-Study: a New Department of Education," by Prof. Oscar Chrisman, February, 1894 (Vol. 16, p. 728).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOME LIFE, ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

On entering an Englishman's house the first thing one notices is how well his house is adapted to him. On entering an American's house the first thing one notices is how well he adapts himself to his house. In England the establishment is carried on with a prime view to the comfort of the man. In America the establishment is carried on with a prime view to the comfort of the woman. Men are more selfish than women, consequently the English home is as a rule more comfortable than the American home. Men demand more and receive more for their money than do women, hence it is likely to follow that a man's house, while it will be less attractive æsthetically, will be more carefully furnished with an eye to material comforts than that of a woman. Then, too, an Englishman is more at home in his own house than is an American. He leaves it later in the morning, returns to it earlier in the afternoon, and gives more of himself to it than does the American. An Englishman is continually going home; an American is continually going to business. One is forever planning and scheming to get home, and to stay at home, and to enjoy the privileges of home; while the other is more apt to devote his energies to make his business a place to go to and in which to spend himself. These minor details of domestic life put their impress upon larger matters of business and politics. It would be worthy of remark should the leader of the Opposition in Congress attack the party in power because a Saturday session prevented them from spending two days a week at home. But it is a matter of course in the English Parliament that Mr. Balfour, as leader of the Opposition, should object strenuously to Mr. Gladstone's plan for a Saturday sitting that debars Englishmen from a Saturday and Sunday at their own firesides. Whether time shall be given for the members of Parliament to go out to dine at leisure, Parish Councils Bill or no Parish Councils Bill, assumes dimensions of grave political importance. But a bitter attack in the American Congress on the topic of the dinner hour would relegate its champion to the realms of dudedom and ridicule.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americans living in England, whether men or women, are struck by the fact that it is the country of men. Likewise Englishmen in America are struck by the fact that America is the country of women. Possibly we might deduce from this that Americans make the better husbands, and the English the better wives. Still the general average of home life is more comfortable in England than in America. Whether it be a matter of political economy or not, it is beyond question that all the requirements for comfortable living are cheaper in England than in America. People having incomes varying from $1,500 to $15,000 a year can and do live more comfortably in England than with us. People with less than $1,500, or with more than $15,000, do not profit greatly by the difference in prices, for the reason that luxury everywhere is expensive, and genteel poverty is everywhere equally distressing.

Nothing gives more conclusive proof of the truth of these comparisons than to notice how the English and the Americans, respectively, go about it to economize. In a large establishment in England the horses for the wife's brougham would go before the husband's hunters, while the reverse of this would be true in an American establishment compelled to make the same sacrifices. It is the husband rather than the wife who is supposed to advertise the family prosperity in England. It would be a very rare case indeed, in America, where the wife would not have more and a greater variety of clothes than her husband; but this is much less true in England. Even poor men in England have more clothes than well-to-do men in America. An income of $5,000 a year in England would mean four times the amount of clothes that the possessor of the same income would think necessary in America. On the other hand, the percentage of any given income, from $3,000 to $20,000, expended by the wives and daughters for clothes, would be half to two-thirds less in England than with us. The last things that an Englishman willingly lets go are the appurtenances and conveniences which permit him to have his friends around him at his own table, and this applies up and down through all but the lowest class. With us, on the contrary, the great mass of our countrymen, outside of a comparatively few dwellers in our larger cities, would scarcely miss the not having people to dine with them at their own table. An Englishman forced to economize would move out of a big house into a small one in order to keep certain conveniences, such as servants and the like, which make for his personal comfort; while an American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would stick to his big house, but cut down the number of servants and other personal comforts. If one were training a race-horse to win an important event, the last thing one would economize upon would be comfortable stabling and the quality of his feed. One is continually reminded of "training" in seeing how the hard-working Englishman, whether in politics, in literature, in business, or in one of the professions, cares for himself and is cared for in his house. Everything bends to the one aim of making him and keeping him "fit." Such men as Gladstone, Balfour, Chamberlain, and Lord Rosebery, to mention only well-known examples, are, so to speak, regularly groomed, and kept in condition physically and mentally, for their arduous duties. They take frequent holidays; everything that paid service can do, from keeping their clothes to attending to their correspondence, they are relieved of. Gladstone is a famous woodsman; Balfour plays golf; Rosebery amuses himself with a racing-stable; Chamberlain is a successful grower of orchids: and thus they make a business of recreation. We venture to say that public opinion in America would not permit a member of the Cabinet to keep a racing-stable, and would probably punish him should it be known that he spent much of his time as a crack golf- or cricket-player. Such a man, with complications of immense importance in Siam and in South Africa on his hands, would be considered to be either mad or a traitor should he devote a day or two to a journey to a race-course, to see one of his horses win the "Suburban." In England these engrossing avocations are deemed to be a wise economy of power; with us they are looked upon as a frivolous waste of energy. Such an innocent recreation as a translation of Virgil probably carried little weight with it in our national Congress, even though the perpetrator was as popular as ex-Governor Long, of Massachusetts, is, and deserves to be. On the other hand, the fame of Gladstone's Homeric heresies produces an undoubted effect, in and out of Parliament, upon both his followers and his opponents.

We are not concerned with the comparative merits of these methods of life; they serve us for the moment merely to illustrate the dominant theme. They all go to show that domestic economy in England is devised for, and directed to, the aim of making the men as capable as possible of doing their work. The home is not a play-house for the women, but a place of rest in which the men may renew their strength. It is possibly fair to say, then, that housekeeping in England has a more definite aim, and consequently more system.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However awkward the English woman may appear upon the boulevards of Paris, however dull she may be when ranged alongside of her American cousin in a drawing-room,—in her own house she has few superiors as a domestic business-manager. And she gains this ability by previous years of training. It is the exception rather than the rule when both the boys and girls in an English family are not given an allowance. It is true that nothing permits of so many shades of meaning as the word "allowance" when thus used. It may mean anything, from a paternal promise to pay which is never fulfilled, to a light advance fund for gloves and bon-bons, to be followed each quarter by the infantry and heavy artillery of dressmakers' and milliners' bills. Those who have suffered in adolescence from the one, and in maturity from the other, know also what a multitude of interpretations lie between these extremes. The British interpretation is, however, serious and fixed. Girls and boys alike are held pretty strictly to an account, and obliged to live upon a certain fixed sum. Women coming into the management of establishments of their own, therefore, are already trained to the business aspect of the situation. They have also a tremendous aid to wise expenditure in public opinion. Nobody, from the Queen down, is either ashamed or afraid to be economical. Money is not so easily made, nor has it such earning-power, in England as in America, and as a consequence it is more carefully cherished. And money buys more in England than in America. It is by no means true, as prevalent opinion leads one to believe, that money plays a greater rôle in America than in England. The "almighty dollar" receives no such obsequious homage in its native lair, as does the "open sesame sovereign" in its own house of worship. Everybody takes "tips" in England, from the Queen, who accepts the empress-ship of India from Disraeli, down to the railway porter content with threepence. The typical American boy abroad, described by Mr. Henry James, whose frequently-repeated motto is: "My dad's all-fired rich!" has many—even more vulgar—prototypes in England. In a country where money is so potent and so difficult to acquire as in England, those who have the disbursing of it must be trained to, or acquire wisdom in, its use, even in the affairs of the household.

The fact that the English house is so ostensibly, and first and foremost, conducted with the aim of making the men comfortable, makes it easy to understand, and to give the reasons for, the greater economy practised therein. Men suffer from a far more severe strain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of competition in England than with us; and economy always, whether it be economy of method, of time, or of money, is just so much saved from the imperative for the voluntary. There is no possibility of great exertion without frequent periods of rest. And this is taken into account here. In England men have more avocations, more amusements, more interests outside of the daily round of pressing business than with us. These avocations demand leisure, and economy is the mother of leisure. The percentage of men who, aside from their engrossing pursuits of business or profession, devote themselves to some "hobby," if one may call it so, is overwhelmingly greater than with us. And one may say unreservedly that this is a good thing. "You'll get no good from all your runnin' or sparrin', sir, without plenty of rest!" was the oft-repeated injunction of an old trainer of athletes. The hour's complete rest after the eight-mile spin was what made the muscle. The employment of a busy man's leisure hours have most to do with making or marring him. "*Le temps le mieux employé est celui qu'on perds!*" The number of men who raise horses, or dogs, or flowers; who are interested in cricket, golf, boating, or tennis; who collect rare books, autograph letters, Japanese curios, or odd bits of porcelain; who are studying an ancient or a modern language; who make a business of doing a bit of travelling every year; who climb mountains or explore new countries; who go in for hunting, shooting, fishing, botany, or geology; who study some branch of archæology or dig for the roots of the family tree, is astonishingly large. Indeed the man of even moderate means who is without some such more or less important recreation is, one may say, almost the exception. To know something about everything, and everything about something, is a good educational ideal, besides giving breadth, variety, and interest to life. An Englishman's holiday is looked forward to, planned for, and provided for with some care, while all too often in America a holiday to a busy man over thirty-five is a white elephant.

One is in little danger of exaggerating the intense competition of English life to-day, which makes it necessary that men should "train" in order to achieve success or even so much as hold their own. Only the fittest and the most "fit" survive! There are more than 1,200 ordained priests of the Anglican church without parishes; 85 per cent of the barristers have nothing to do; 80 per cent of the medical men do not make $1,200 a year. The agricultural depression of late years has been such that incomes from land have been sadly re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duced all around. The great increase, in the last twenty years, of facilities for gaining something of an education at small cost, has flooded the market with both men and women who are ready to sell or to rent their small intellectual equipments at almost starvation prices. Even when one goes farther up the ladder, there are very many more men in England than in America, who feel this pressure of competition and who prepare themselves and look after themselves accordingly. The swarms of Englishmen in South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, China, and Japan, and the large number of them in the northwestern parts of our own country, attest the fact that only the best equipped and the very strongest can hold their own in the tight little island itself. At this time a gentleman with a fair income has his oldest boy of nineteen at work with the village blacksmith, and the next, a boy of seventeen, in a neighboring carpenter's shop, and some months later they will leave home to try farming in Manitoba. This is not an isolated example. There are hundreds of gentlemen's sons who are obliged to leave England to find occupation and a living. One does not wonder, then, at the domestic economy, nor, on the other hand, at the applause, the obsequiousness, almost the servility, which greet success in England.

Of all nations in the world, with perhaps the exception of our own, England has had the reputation, at least, of demanding that success should be accompanied by virtue. But the strife has become so keen that even this imperative consideration is sometimes lost sight of. So long as a statesman keeps within legal bounds he is judged rather by the power he wields than by his reputation at the club or in his home. It may be said that genius has always everywhere been permitted a certain license, but that is not the point at issue here. There is an easily recognized difference between power and genius; the one representing the result of organization, the other the result of temperament: and even to the former there is to-day accorded a liberty in the realm of morals which the great mass of the English people permit because they are forced to do so by the exigencies of this keen competitive strife. Indeed it may be said, without much fear of successful contradiction, that if the private life of every public man in England were submitted to the same scrutiny that follows his public performances, there would be more reversals of judgment there than would result from the same kind of criticism applied to public men in America. It is the fashion with us—and it may be doubted whether it is a good one—to sneer at politicians and politics, and to start

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movements and to form societies, every now and again, for the propagation of the gospel among them. It is generally found, however, after each of these ethical rebellions, that the so-called—and self-styled—good men have weaknesses which interfere sadly with the political millennium that they propose to bring in. The recent revelations in our State Department of what a high priest of civil-service reform may do when he is given the opportunity to practise what he has preached, is only one instance among many of the assumption of the armor of political integrity by men too small to fight in it. It is fair, in conclusion, to say of this particular question that public men —at any rate successful public men in England, share in the honors, privileges, and in the pardon granted to every kind of success here.

We make mention of these apparently disconnected points because in reality they are the things which force the managers of English households to economize. In a country where the competition is excessive; where money has unwonted power to purchase comfort, charitable judgment, and distinguished consideration; where success is greeted with an enthusiasm almost unknown elsewhere; and where failure and mediocrity are forced to play the rôle of obsequiousness if not of servility,—the men must be cared for and trained to win. Only a man of gigantic abilities can be uncomfortable and miserable at home, and at the same time successful in the world. English women appreciate this. They know that they can only properly prevail through the honors and distinctions of the men. The proportion of English women who make men comfortable is very large; but, be it said, the proportion of American women who make men comfortable, and also proud and happy, is probably greater. No man knows just how much tiresome routine and minute supervision go to make that sum total of comfort in his home of which we are speaking. But every man knows that economy and system are the elementary principles which must underlie any such happy consummation.

The economies practised in very many English households, both great and small, would almost be called meannesses with us. To begin with, houses are less extravagantly though more conveniently furnished in those regions not entered by the public or one's friends. The furnishings of the living-rooms and sleeping-rooms are curtailed —not, however, to the point of discomfort—in order that the general average of comfort throughout the house shall be higher. The linen-room, store-room, and wine-cellar departments are guarded by lock and key, and managed with a scrupulous nicety of calculation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soap, candles, trifles for the stable and kitchen,—in short, all the minor details of housekeeping,—are looked after as carefully as are the minor expenditures in a great business house. The fact that a saving in candle-ends, persisted in for a year, amounts to something, is taken into account. The economy which pervades the management of the household machinery influences the servants as well. The cost of the butter used each week by a cook (whose name for reasons of charity we forbear to give) in a city house in America equalled what is paid, in an establishment on an exactly similar scale in England, for all the vegetables and fruit for the same length of time. It is, however, to be noted in this connection, by the English reader, that a cook of Irish extraction in an American establishment occupies an autocratic position which has no parallel in England. As compared with America, servants are plenty and good in England. Here, again, competition enters as an influential factor. Men and women servants are a recognized and self-respecting class in England. Domestic service and politics are not considered the sole employments which require no preliminary training. They enter this service and devote themselves to it, and work to rise in, not to escape from it. Much is expected of them, and, comparatively speaking, much is received from them. Servants' wages, even including beer-money, in England, are much lower than in America. A cook in England receives from $125 a year in the country to $200 in London,—more, of course, in large establishments. Housemaids receive from $80 in the country to $120 in London. Of men-servants it is not so easy to speak in figures. A good all-round man-servant, where only one is kept, may not cost more than $125 a year in the country. In London, however, men-servants are sometimes paid fancy prices, and a man with beautiful calves, six feet of height, and a clear complexion, commands, up to certain limits, his own price. One gentleman of sporting proclivities tries to have a groom for each of his hunters whose complexion and hair are suited to the color of a particular mount. Tall parlor-maids fetch more than short ones, and not long ago we saw an advertisement in the London "Daily Telegraph" for a man-servant, who was expected to look after a pony and make himself useful in the house, and also to sing in the choir of the parish church; the wages offered for such a domestic Admirable Crichton being $120. An advertisement for a governess for two little girls, the wages offered being $125 a year, brought 162 replies in two days.

It may be seen at a glance, even from these few facts, that ser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vants are cheaper, better trained, more plenty, and more satisfied with their position as servants, than in America. This state of things below-stairs materially lessens the difficulties of housekeeping economically, although there are some women who would have good and faithful servants in Seringapatam, and others who could not keep a cook in Paradise. We have no desire to enter the arena of the Servant Question. As in religion and politics, it is, far oftener than is admitted, a matter of temperament rather than anything else. This is not accepted, because very few people are willing to accept a simple explanation of a complicated problem. It concerns us only to state that servants' wages in England are, roughly speaking, 50 per cent less than in America.

The reasons why economy is more general in English than in American households are scarcely more important than the results of such economy. The best and all-sufficient result is that economy gives leisure. System, and regularity, and lack of worry, give men more time to sleep, more time to eat, more time to play, and more time and a better preparation for work. In America our first distinguished men were from the South, where men had most leisure, and next from prosperous New England. And, say what one may—and there is much to be said—of the advantages of a hard taskmaster like poverty, it must be granted that the larger part of the distinguished work of the world has been done, and is done, by men who have had, or who have made for themselves, leisure. The man who voluntarily permits, or who is forced by circumstances to permit, things to get into the saddle and ride, necessarily lacks the confidence and the mastery which marks off the men who ride from the men who are ridden. Mr. Buckle, after his manner, would no doubt deduce from these facts that the saving of candle-ends in English households results in the colonizing of the globe by Englishmen. One need hardly go to such lengths, and yet it were unfair to English women, whose reputation for bad taste in dress and for hobbledehoy shyness of manner is already a sufficient handicap, not to say that the efficient ordering of their households has very much to do with the working power of their men at home, and the influence and valor of their men abroad.

The very fact that Englishmen are such hardy explorers and such persistent settlers of the waste places of the earth attests their love of home. They go, not because they wish to go, but because they hope to return with enough to establish a home in England. Neither

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English men nor English women like the unattached and nomadic existence of the hotel and the boarding-house. The proportion of Americans who could have a modest home, but who prefer the flat and stale unprofitableness of hotels and boarding-houses, is, as compared with English people of the same income, vastly greater. And perhaps no one cause of the stricter economy practised in English households is more potent than this, the last one we offer. To have a house and a bit of garden of one's own, an English man or woman will submit to the utmost economy of expenditure and the most rigorously accurate system of accounts. It may be a social prejudice or an ingrained habit of the British stamp of mind, but, whatever it is, there can be no doubt of the fact itself. To have a home, and to keep a house for one's own comfort and as a place in which to entertain one's friends, is a consideration of prime importance. Hence the men are trained and cared for, that they may earn enough for its support; and the women are put upon their mettle to make what is earned go as far as possible. To a far greater extent than is commonly conceived, this domestic economy throws light upon the large questions of British politics, whether domestic or foreign; and, conversely, British politics, both at home and abroad, are focussed upon the maintenance of thousands of homes in comfort and security. Home rule for Ireland, the Parish Councils Bill, the Employers' Liability Bill, which are just now the gist of political discussion in England, are—one discovers on close investigation—argued for and against, ever with an eye to their probable bearing upon British domestic economy. The severest stricture upon Mr. Gladstone's political course by his opponents is that he neglects Imperial interests in his desire for a mere party majority. The translation of that is that it is considered the most fatal thing to be said against the greatest Englishman living, that he subordinates the safety of British commerce, and consequently the security of British possessions and incomes, and thus necessarily the peace and comfort of English homes, to his own ambition.

PRICE COLLIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESIDENT ELIOT'S TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE.

PRESIDENT CHARLES W. ELIOT is closing the twenty-fifth year of his Presidency of Harvard University. His service has been longer than the combined terms of his five predecessors in office, Hill, Felton, Walker, Sparks, and Everett. The term has been exceeded by only one of his twenty-one predecessors, the beloved Holyoke, who served for thirty-two years (1737–1769). Its length is likewise conspicuous among the presidencies of other colleges. Of the presidents of Yale, only two, Clapp and Day, enjoyed a longer time. Clapp's term was only one year longer, and Day's four. Woolsey resigned at the end of his twenty-fifth year. Thirty-six of the one hundred years of Williams College are covered by the presidency of the great Hopkins. Nathan Lord was president of Dartmouth thirty-five years. The longest term at Amherst is that of the gentle Stearns, which was somewhat less than twenty-five years. Wayland's great work at Brown University began in 1827 and closed in 1855. From 1804 to 1852 Nott ruled over Union, and it was only at his death in 1866 that his formal successor was chosen,—a length of service quite unique. Among the longer and more conspicuous presidencies outside of the New England colleges is that of Angell of the University of Michigan, but it will be two years before he completes his quarter-century of service. But these instances are of exceptional length. The usual term at Harvard has been a little less than twelve years.

President Eliot, like his predecessor Quincy, regards the administration of a university as a business. He is not, like Hopkins, first a great teacher and secondly an administrator. He is not, like Porter, of Yale, who was his contemporary in office for fifteen years, first an author and secondly an administrator. Nor is he, like Woolsey, first a scholar and secondly an administrator. Rather, he is first and last and only a university administrator. He illustrates the fact of making such presidency a business.

To the doing of this business President Eliot brought and brings a vigorous and impressive personality, distinguished alike for moral

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and intellectual parts. Yet the intellectual side is more conspicuous and dominant. But the will of this personality is yet more conspicuous and more dominant than the intellect. The proportion calls to mind the remark of Schopenhauer that the normal man is two-thirds will and one-third intellect. President Eliot has a full and clear conception of what education from the primary school to the university ought to be. His energy as an administrator is worthy of his conception. He is not a doctrinaire only. He has a deep and intimate acquaintance with affairs, and that acquaintance extends to details. The union of the philosophical and the practical in him is quite unique. When one attempts the rather difficult task of naming the chief intellectual or other characteristic of this vigorous personality, he is tempted to give to any one of several qualities pre-eminence. I am inclined to think, however, that fearlessness is the quality that is pre-eminent. Fearlessness arises either from the consciousness of power or from the knowledge of the absence of danger. In President Eliot it arises from the consciousness of power. In this fearlessness he possesses clearness of vision, loyalty to duty, independence, equanimity, persistence, constructiveness. His confidence in his own conceptions as true, and in his own convictions as right, is worthy of Luther. He has a sense of frankness which immediately and utterly disproves the common remark that "all college presidents are liars." He has nothing of that "pleasure" which Bacon suggests, in his essay on Truth, as the "mixture of a lie." He accomplishes nothing by indirection. His fearlessness is so great that he seems to court perils. Occasionally it appears as if he went out of his way to woo opposition, and, not infrequently, we know he has been successful in this quest. This fearlessness is never bluster. He has a gentle severity, born not of feebleness, but of abounding and well-conserved strength. This courage is an essential part of a man who is gifted with leadership. President Eliot is one of Lowell's men of "light and leading." He is, like most reformers, at once a pessimist and an optimist. Every reformer is a pessimist in the present tense,—he sees and knows the evils out of which he wants to get. Every reformer is an optimist in the future tense,—he has a vision of the blessedness into which he wants to go. The constructive element in this man is more vigorous than the iconoclastic. If he tears down,—and he does tear down,—it is only to build up. I am inclined to believe that he has very much more respect for existing institutions than he receives credit for. He is a conservative, but he has an open

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mind. He has more regard for man than he has for men. He honors the presidency of Harvard University more than he honors the president of Harvard University, whoever that president may be.

Akin to his fearlessness is his positiveness. He takes sides, and has no thought of concealing which side it is that he takes. He is no "trimmer." He is a partisan in political and social questions,—questions about which prejudice is sensitive to the quick. The contrast between him and a predecessor in office, also confessedly great, is sharp. Dr. A. P. Peabody said of President Walker:

> "I ought not to omit mention of what seemed his intended and studied neutrality . . . on such subjects in religion, ethics, philosophy, politics, and practical life, as divide the opinion of honest, right-minded, well-disposed Christian men. He was far enough from being double-tongued. He could not be equally claimed on either side, but seemed to be on either side, of mooted questions of all kinds. A friend of mine, learning that he was going to preach at King's Chapel, on a Thanksgiving Day, on Popular Amusements, went to hear him with a special desire to know what he thought of the theatre, which in Boston was then just coming from evil into fair repute. His report was that he heard from Dr. Walker more in favor of the theatre than he had ever imagined, and more against it than he had ever known, but it was impossible to ascertain from the sermon whether the preacher approved or condemned theatre-going."[1]

President Eliot knows, and is very willing for the world to know, his opinion upon any subject upon which it may become his duty, or even his right, to have an opinion; and of the truthfulness and rightfulness of his opinion he seems absolutely sure. He converts his opinions into principles.

The relations which a university president holds are probably at once more numerous, more distinct, and more important than those held by any other public officer. It is easy to explain the relations which the head of a college holds to the students, to the faculty, and to the various governing boards, to the fitting-schools, and to the community. The relations which the president of Harvard University bears to these various classes are of public importance, and, as embodied in President Eliot, they serve to illustrate qualities of character.

It must be confessed that the relation which President Eliot bears to the individual student is slight and remote, but the relation which he sustains to the whole body of students is intimate and strong. I presume scores of men graduate from Harvard University and never come into a relation with its official head any closer than is seen in the receiving of a diploma from his hand. Yet it is not for the individual student, but for the whole body of students, that the Uni-

[1] "Harvard Graduates Whom I Have Known," pp. 133, 134.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

versity exists. It may be said, indeed, that the statute respecting the duty of the president is framed on the supposition of the absence of personal relation. Within a few months after President Eliot came to this office, the following statute was framed:

"It is the duty of the President of the University to reside in Cambridge; to call meetings of the Corporation, and preside at the same; to act as the ordinary medium of communication between the Corporation and Overseers and between the Corporation and Faculties; to make a report to the Overseers, at their annual meeting, on the general condition of the University; to preside on public Academic days; to preside over the several Faculties; to superintend the official correspondence of the University; to acquaint himself with the state, interests, and wants of the whole institution; and to exercise a general superintendence over all its concerns." [1]

It is the dean of the University whose duty it is to do the work and occupy the place in respect to individual students usually belonging to the president. It would be indeed universally confessed that every student at Harvard suffers a loss in not being known by and in not knowing the president; but this is simply saying that the University has many advantages which it cannot make available for each of its students. No method of securing any worthy degree of knowledge, on the part of the president, of the individual students, or of their personal acquaintance with himself, seems possible. A few men there are, who, with a genius for friendship, might come into personal relations with two thousand students or more, but it would always be a question whether this were the most remunerative expenditure of time and of energy. And yet the personality of President Eliot is felt by every student. His life lives in the life of the University. The University is his *alter ego*. It is known that his methods are the methods by which the University is conducted; that his scholastic principles are the principles of education and instruction. With the students he has avoided collisions. I do not recall any rebellions. Every respect is paid, and admiration is always and freely given. It can hardly be said that the students love him; they do not know him well enough. It is their loss and also his. If any one can discover and apply a method by which a college administrator who has no peculiar genius for forming and holding personal relationships can know by name and be known by each of fifteen hundred students or more, and also do the business of his office, he will do very much for Harvard and also for every other large college.

A college president may bear any one of three relations to his

[1] "Forty-fifth Annual Report by the President of Harvard College, 1869–70," p. 11.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

associates who compose that body known as the Faculty. He may attempt to be the ruler of this body; he may be willing to be its servant; he may be its presiding officer and its executive. The first, the monarchical method, usually results in personal and official differences,—differences which constantly promote many college evils, and which usually result in the abdication of the monarch. The second, the underlying method, likewise assures usually a brevity and always an inefficiency of administration. The third, the democratic method, promotes harmony, comprehensiveness of plan and work, unity, and efficiency too, if the president himself be efficient. This democratic relation represents with the least degree of inaccuracy the relation of the Faculty and of the official boards at Cambridge. The president of Harvard is at once *par inter pares*, and, I may add, *superior inter pares*. A certain autocracy usually belongs to the ablest leaders, and President Eliot is not free from having a certain form of autocracy; but he wishes only that leadership which his principles demand and the conditions necessitate. It is not to be denied that the Harvard Faculty is itself an institution at once very democratic and very autocratic. It appreciates its right to say its say and vote its vote, and the will of the Faculty is the will that prevails.

Harvard University has the advantage or disadvantage of having in its organization two legal bodies, the one known as the Corporation, the other as the Overseers. The Corporation has five members and is a self-perpetuating body. The Overseers number thirty and are elected by the graduates. That college president who is the president of the legal Board as well as of the Faculty has a great advantage in the conduct of affairs. The president of Harvard University is president of the Corporation. He is not president of, and is not a member of, the Board of Overseers, except *ex officio*. The relation which the president bears toward these bodies should be of the same kind which he sustains toward the Faculty,—a democratic leadership. But if he be not a regular member of a legal board, he often finds it difficult to get near enough to its members to be their leader. The superb quality of leadership which the President of Harvard University represents has had less power with the Overseers than with any other of the official boards. The Board of Overseers has often proved a brake on the swiftly-moving wheels of the University wagon. Its members are of mature years, and it may be inferred that the President sometimes fails to find that support and sympathy which he desires for solving the problems of present crises. In the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Annual Report of 1882–83, made, as is every report, to the Board of Overseers itself, he says:

"When the act of 1865 gave to the Alumni the power of electing the Overseers, it was imagined that the electors, a larger part of whom would be young men, might choose a youthful and inexperienced board. The actual result has been quite the reverse. Only one of the present Board is under forty, only ten of the thirty elected members are under fifty, and the average age of the elected members is fifty-seven. No member of the Board graduated in arts later than 1866, and on the average the Board may be said to have graduated more than thirty-five years ago, at a time when the University was very unlike the institution of to-day. Such elderly men may be distinguished representatives of the Alumni, and may, perhaps, be in a position to enjoy the advantage of advice from sons or grandsons now or recently members of the University; but their personal recollections of college life are less serviceable to them as University legislators than the recollections of much younger men would be."[1]

President Eliot has put himself into very close relations with the system of public schools in Massachusetts. This relation has been rather with the system than with the individual members composing it. He has, without faltering and under an apparent sense of obligation to public duty, pointed out serious defects in this lower education, and has felt free to suggest remedies for eliminating evils. It is not to be doubted that the teaching of elementary science in the grammar and high schools is due to his recommendations. He has remembered at once that the president of Harvard University should do whatever it is possible to do to make American education of every grade better, and he also has not forgotten that he wants boys to graduate from Harvard before they are twenty-three. In making his criticisms he has often sacrificed graciousness to force,—a sacrifice which possibly it was necessary to make in order to secure the desired results. But, at all events, these criticisms and directions have tended to organize American public education upon a wiser and better basis, to increase respect for the teaching profession, and to save the student from unnecessary labor and the people from unwise expenditures.

As soon as one touches the relation of President Eliot to public education, one approaches the most important point in his entire administrative career,—his relation to the community.

It is right here that one finds the secret of the administration of President Eliot. This is, that he has kept himself and the University in vital touch with the community. He has co-ordinated it with the other social, commercial, and educational forces of the time. He has made it a university for the men who are to rule affairs in the last

[1] "Annual Reports," 1882–83, pp. 43, 44.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years of the present and the first years of the next century,—a university for citizens of the United States. President Eliot himself says:

> "It is the principal function of a university to train leaders,—men who have originating power, who reach forward, and in all fields of activity push beyond the beaten paths of habit, tradition, and custom." [1]

This intimacy of relationship between the community and the university has not resulted from an appeal to prejudice, or to any unworthy principle of human life or character. It has resulted from a constant and impressive recognition of the highest elements in humanity. The President himself has set up the standards to which the community ought to come, and he has done much toward bringing public sentiment and action up to those standards.

This fact of sympathy with life seems to explain several of the more significant events and tendencies of this administration. Doubtless President Eliot's most conspicuous work is the introduction of the elective system, a subject which he discusses in nearly every one of his reports from 1879 to 1884. And what is the purpose of this system for which he has fought early, late, hard, and triumphantly? Is it not to promote concentration and thoroughness for the great objects of living; to make every man's intellectual habit a custom-made, and not a ready-made, garment; to promote individuality? Is its ideal anything lower than to equip each man to make the largest contribution to the betterment of the race? Not infrequently the discussion of the elective system has served to give the impression that the system was a good thing in itself, but of course it is good only for what it does. Is not, then, its chief and comprehensive aim to adjust a college education to life? It must be confessed, and with sadness, that the American college has not always been in very close touch with life. If it has not had too much of *other*-worldliness, it has not had enough of *this*-worldliness. It has been too monastic, too conventual, too conventional. Against such a spirit Harvard has in its elective system set its face for twenty-five years.

Singular as at first sight it may appear, the advanced instruction offered to graduates represents this same movement toward life which the elective system embodies. This work frequently represents rather the advancement of knowledge than the advancement of education; and this advancement of knowledge is of course a purpose which the university is coming more and more to recognize as one of its most

[1] "Annual Reports," 1876–77, p. 24.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important services. But the graduate department is also designed to train leaders strong and wise, sufficient and efficient. The need of such leaders is dire in places of legislation and of popular debate and direction. Many of the men who are working for the higher degrees are to become teachers, and so leaders of leaders,—a leadership which is of the most worth. Harvard has not done any work more admirably than in training its graduates, or graduates of other colleges, for such service. It is ever to be borne in mind that these services have the closest relation with the more influential part of humanity, and so represent important relations to all human life.

No work of the University represents more closely the endeavor to put itself into touch with the best life of the community than the recent history of its two largest professional schools, those of Medicine and of Law. The state of the best of these schools in the last half of the seventh decade of the century was bad. Most of them were proprietary. The course of instruction covered only two years; and in each year of the Medical School the chief instruction was given in a "winter term," covering only the shortest days and the longest nights of the calendar year. The Law-schools were not so wretchedly off as the Medical; but they admitted almost every applicant, and the requirements for receiving the degree of bachelor of laws were notoriously lax. The community more easily appreciated the danger of turning loose upon itself hundreds of ill-trained doctors than of ill-trained lawyers. Therefore the improvement of our medical schools preceded and is still preceding the improvement of our law-schools. The lengthening of the term to four years, the increasing severity of examinations, the larger introduction of clinics and of laboratory work, are only the endeavor to cause the University to minister more simply, more powerfully, and more constantly to the welfare of the community. This improvement President Eliot has probably been more instrumental than any other in bringing about.

Several of the facts and tendencies of this administration, be they more or less important, classify themselves under this same law of the putting of Harvard University in closest touch with life. What other meaning has the endeavor to shorten the college course than the endeavor to get men into their careers earlier than at the present lamentably late age? Or what other meaning has the effort to lessen the age at which most men come up to their Freshman examinations? What does the admission of that anomalous and increasing body known as "special students" signify, except that the University desires to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minister to all men to whom it can be of service? What means the variety of courses in which the student may be examined for entrance to college, or what means holding entrance examinations in places scattered round the globe, except that the college respects that diversity of training and conditions which characterizes life? What interpretation is to be put upon the principle of voluntary attendance upon college exercises, if not that the college man is to assume that freedom and personal responsibility which life itself offers? Are not the statements of the needs of the College and of the University, which begin in the first annual report, and the admirable exhibitions of the treasurer, and the summaries of these exhibits made by the President, the worthiest appeal to the principles of wisdom and of generosity prevailing in the community? The money distributed each year in scholarships and loan funds puts the University into relationship with a part of the people from which it would otherwise be obliged to hold itself aloof. The President appeals for cheap board and cheap rooms in Cambridge as a necessary means for building a great popular institution.[1] The system of University preachers represents a like endeavor to keep the University in touch with the controlling public forces. The books and articles written by the professors in these twenty-five years; the "evening readings"; the free policy as to the use of the library and of the museums; the placing of certain parts of the play-grounds at the disposal of the people in the vacation,— illustrate this characteristic movement of the University toward life.

These considerations impel me to the conclusion that the secret of this administration lies in putting the University in touch with humanity itself. This conclusion I had reached when I read the following from President Angell's address at the 250th Anniversary:

> "Never before did the college and the people come so near together. Those who do not accept the doctrines in favor here, and those who do, are alike indebted to you, for we have all been stirred. In college life, as in all life, anything is better than stagnation. . . . It is simply justice to you to say that it is largely due to you that educational problems are studied afresh in the light of the facts and the news of to-day, as they never were studied before." [2]

One cannot doubt that this movement is already having at least two large results: First, it is increasing the variety of callings which graduates enter. The institution was founded to train men for the ministry, and more than half of the early graduates illustrated in themselves the securing of this end. At the present time, of the

[1] "Annual Reports," 1890–91, pp. 36, 37.

[2] "Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Harvard College," p. 292.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members of the ten classes from 1867–76, only 5 per cent were, three years after graduation, either ministers or proposing to become ministers. The percentage in the other professions was: law, 36 per cent; medicine, 10 per cent; teaching, 9 per cent; scientific work, 6 per cent; business, 21 per cent; miscellaneous and unknown, 13 per cent. A second fact may also be noted, that this movement is tending to extend the geographical range whence students come to college. This increasing extent of the distribution of students is apparently so important to President Eliot than he refers to it in at least three reports. In the report of 1882–83 (p. 10) he says:

"Sixty years ago, 79 per cent of the students in the University came from New England; thirty years ago, 75 per cent; three years ago, 72 per cent, and now only 67 per cent. During the past three years the percentage of students from Massachusetts has fallen from 61½ to 54."

The commercial method of judging of the success of a college administration is as common as it is easy; but, however successful it might prove President Eliot to be, it is not, I am sure, the one by which he would prefer to have his work judged. Of course this method exhibits magnificent progress and the noblest and absolutely unique results. Some of these results are shown in the following statement, furnished from the office of the Treasurer under date of Nov. 10, 1893:

"Sept. 1, 1869, the University funds amounted to $2,257,989.80
"Aug. 1, 1892, " " " " 7,838,244.98

"Their amount, Aug. 1, 1893, awaits the balancing of the books to be finally determined, but is probably $8,390,543.53. President Eliot came into office in May, 1869. The amount given you (the first item) is for the end of the financial year then current.

"In answering your question as to buildings, I shall not include in the list buildings which have been bought or erected as investments, and which have valuations in the College books of account as investments of permanent funds. Following is the list:

Cambridge.

1869–76.	Memorial Hall and Sanders Theatre.....	$368,980.90
1869–91.	Museum of Comparative Zoölogy and University Museum (including Geology, Botany, and Mineralogy sections). Cost unknown. Estimated at.....	550,000.00
1869–70.	Thayer Hall (estimated).....	100,000.00
1870–71.	Botanic Laboratory and Lecture Room (estimated).....	15,000.00
1871–72.	Weld Hall (estimated).....	87,000.00
1871–72.	Matthews Hall (estimated).....	113,000.00
1874–75.	Hospital	3,500.00
1875–78.	Library Addition	89,012.68
1877–89.	Peabody Museum of American Archæology and Ethnology	115,521.72
1878–82.	Sever Hall.....	117,040.32

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1878–79.	Hemenway Gymnasium (estimated)	103,000.00
1882–85.	Austin Hall (Law School)	153,744.63
1883–86.	Jefferson Physical Laboratory	116,690.24
1886–88.	Divinity Library	41,970.88
1888–89.	Walter Hastings Hall	243,215.95
1890–91.	Carey Athletic Building	38,540.04
1891–92.	Rotch Electrical Workshop (addition to Scientific School)	6,427.29

"Two new dormitories, Perkins Hall and Conant Hall, to cost about $160,000 and $110,000 respectively, are now building; and the Fogg Art Museum, to cost about $150,000, will shortly be begun, but the money to be used for these buildings is included in the amount of University funds Aug. 1, 1893, as given you above.

Boston (including West Roxbury).

1870–72.	Bussey Institution (stone building)	$47,654.40
1873–76.	" " (Professor's House)	9,723.63
1884–87.	School of Veterinary Medicine (part of) (Land cost in addition $4,115.63.)	11,124.22
1879–84.	New Medical School (Land cost in addition $83,325.)	240,311.33
1889–90.	Sears Laboratory (addition to Medical School)	36,166.77

"The above is, I believe, a complete list, 1869–1893. Holyoke House, which was built in 1872–73 at a cost of $120,845.12, was built, and is still held, as an investment. Where the cost is marked (estimated) the building was built wholly with money which did not come into the possession of the College, and in regard to which no exact statement has been received from the giver, except that, in the case of the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy and University Museum, part was paid through the College. ALLEN DANFORTH, *Dep. Treas.*"

The success of a university, however, is to be judged by the type of manhood which it trains, and we may here inquire what is the type which the American college is developing. Would it be just to say that it includes, first, the gentleman; second, the thinker; third, the scholar; and fourth, the seeker for truth? And what, let me ask, is the type of manhood which Harvard is forming? One is opening himself to charges of all sorts in asking whether its elements include first, the gentleman; second, the seeker for truth; third, the scholar; and fourth, the thinker? In his oration at the 250th Anniversary Mr. Lowell said:

"Let it be our hope to make a gentleman of every youth who is put under our charge; not a conventional gentleman, but a man of culture, a man of intellectual resource, a man of public spirit, a man of refinement, with that good taste which is the conscience of the mind, and that conscience which is the good taste of the soul. This we have tried to do in the past; this let us try to do in the future."[1]

It was said of John Harvard that he was "a godly gentleman and a great lover of learning." But the same may be said of the typical

[1] Prose Works, VI. 177, 178.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man whom John Harvard's bounty has helped for all these years to educate, although one would perhaps not be inclined to put upon the epithet preceding the word "gentleman" the emphasis which might be put upon it when applied to the generous non-conforming clergyman. The Harvard man is also true to the word "Veritas" written upon the three open books of the seal of the University. He seeks for truth out of books, and also in,—everywhere. The words which Lowell writes of Truth in the Commemoration Ode are indeed themselves essentially true as applied to the present graduate:—

> "Many loved Truth, and lavished life's best oil
> Amid the dust of books to find her,
> . . . . . .
> Many in sad faith sought for her,
> Many with crossed hands sighed for her;
> But these, our brothers, fought for her,
> At life's dear peril wrought for her,
> So loved her that they died for her."

The Harvard man is a scholar. The University specially endeavors to cultivate scholarship, and does it seem to be bluster to say that Harvard has a better equipment for its cultivation than any other University? The type of thinking which the University promotes is rather of the critical than of the creative type, but of course this is simply again saying that the University is sympathetic with the age. A teacher at Harvard, writing of Yale, has said: "The essential object of the institution is still to educate rather than instruct, to be the mother of men rather than a school of doctors."[1] Is it true that to Harvard the reverse of these aptly chosen phrases may be applied, and that Harvard is a school of doctors rather than a mother of men? Is it in fact not true that Harvard is continuing the English tradition of culturing her students rather than adopting the German principle of educating them?

I am quite confident that the four elements or qualities which I have attributed to the Harvard man will be usually assented to. I am yet more confident that the order of my arrangement of these excellences as embodying Harvard's training will be objected to. I am also perfectly sure that there is the utmost diversity of judgment as to what is the proper or absolute order as to these excellences. I shall not cumber these pages with discussions endeavoring to prove that the Harvard order is the proper order, but I shall venture to

[1] George Santayana, "Glimpses of Yale," Harvard Monthly, December, 1892, p. 95.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quote a few sentences to establish the general proposition that to make the gentleman is the prime purpose of a university training:

"If, then, a practical end must be assigned to a university course, I say it is that of training good members of society. Its art is the art of social life, and its end is fitness for the world. It neither confines its view to particular professions on the one hand, nor creates heroes or inspires genius on the other. Works, indeed, of genius fall under no art; heroic minds come under no rule; a university is not a birthplace of poets, or of immortal authors, of founders of schools, leaders of colonies, or conquerors of nations. It does not promise a generation of Aristotles or Newtons, of Napoleons or Washingtons, of Raphaels or Shakespeares, though such miracles of nature it has before now contained within its precincts. But a university training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end: it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society; at cultivating the public mind; at purifying the national taste; at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspiration; at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age; at facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life." [1]

President Eliot says little as to the purpose of the University or as to the elements which the educated man should embody and represent. He is usually and chiefly concerned with means and with methods; but it is certainly significant that the statement of a Roman Catholic cardinal, of the purpose of a university training, should so closely coincide with the results of the training which Harvard gives.

It is, however, only fair to add that Cardinal Newman believes that the function of liberal education is much narrower than the function which is usually attributed to the American college. It is usually and strongly said of the American college that it is designed to make men. Its purpose is ethical, religious, spiritual, as well as intellectual. It is concerned with all that goes to make up strong but great character. But Cardinal Newman, though appreciating as strongly as any one can appreciate the need of complete manhood, does not think that the university can secure this completeness, for he says:

"Quarry the granite rock with razors, or moor the vessel with a thread of silk; then may you hope with such keen and delicate instruments as human knowledge and human reason to contend against those giants, the passion and the pride of man." [2]

In the American college, the "passion and the pride of man" are elements to be constantly and severely dealt with.

President Dwight, of Yale, in his Inaugural Address, said:

"It is the priceless privilege of a university teacher to help the manly youth around him in their souls' living, to make them more generous, more truthful,

[1] Cardinal Newman, "Idea of a University," pp. 177, 178. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 121.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more fit for life in this earnest, struggling world, more worthy of love and respect."

Such is also the conception of President Eliot. Though the public statements made by him present rather the facts as to the material growth of the University than respecting its ethical relations, yet these relations are made conspicuous in fact. It is not going too far to say that Harvard has an ethical and moral method more definite than obtains in most universities. It is the method of training character under the conditions of moral freedom. The University gives men a freedom which is most akin to that freedom which, for some reason, the Author of our being has given to each of us. With full knowledge that some men will abuse this freedom, yet with the assurance that more and most will be advantaged by it, the University adopts this system. It lays down few rules. Its chief principles are the principles which belong to good society. I sometimes, however, think that this system is a bit too free for the boys who enter the Freshman class. Should not they have a period of infantile probation such as belongs to most of us flung into this world of temptation? Some Freshmen certainly give reason for believing that they need better guidance and more restraint than they do get. It must also be confessed that there is a feeling in the heart of the community that the Harvard man is allowed to go to the bad a little too easily. Of course one recognizes the commonplace as to the autocracy of the human will, and also the truth in the remark that if a man is determined to go to the bad he will go anyway. Yet, few men are determined to be bad. Most men are bad because badness lies in the line of the least resistance. The condition of moral freedom which Harvard represents, demands, it is always to be affirmed, large and vigorous personalities on the part of teachers and guardians. The conditions demand that, again to quote President Dwight, for substance, "the teacher shall not think that his work is ended when he has heard his recitation or given his lecture." They demand that every man shall make himself an adviser to every student to whom his counsel may be of the least worth. These conditions, by the way, represent the most taxing of all methods of university administration. It is easy to govern by rules. Secure a sheet of paper. Print upon it the rules. Keep tallies of disobediences; and when marks are enough, discipline your student. That is governing by rules. It is hard to govern by personality, for governing by personality stands for vigilance, wisdom, love.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Santayana, before quoted, has said: "Yale has a religion." He also says:

"Harvard has a religion, although it is less obvious and articulate than that of Yale. I do not mean that we have here our Young Men's Christian Association, our chapel, our charities, our Divinity School, and our Christian philosophers. We have all these things, as, with our generous conception of a university, it is right and natural that we should have them. No one, however earnest his faith, need be afraid of isolation among us. But beneath these specifically religious forces, and permeating the whole community, there is, I think, a vaguer but deeper religion,—the faith in enlightenment, the aspiration to be just, the sympathy with the multiform thoughts and labors of humanity."[1]

"Faith in enlightenment, the aspiration to be just, the sympathy with the multiform thoughts and labors of humanity," are of course very praiseworthy conditions, but are they not a bit vague to be worthy of being made the doctrines of a religion? If religion is simply "morality touched with emotion," these phrases might possibly serve as the four points of some new docked ethical Calvinism. But are these qualities often not touched with emotion? Are they hardly warm enough to allow us to apply to them Professor Park's principle of the theology of the feelings? And, too, if we apply to them the principles of the theology of the intellect, do they not seem a bit inadequate for a creed? There is reason, I am sure, to believe that Harvard represents a more definite and vigorous religious faith than these fine phrases intimate.

For the American colleges represent three types of religion. One type is denominationalism,—a college founded by a Church and the servant of the Church. Such was the original Harvard. Such are many colleges established in the western movement of people. One type is a broad-church Christianity such as I interpret Williams and Dartmouth to represent; and one type is a Christianity such as I understand the ordinary State university to embody. Much might be said in favor of denominationalism during certain periods of the development of any people. Less, very much less, might be said in favor of it as it now exists in certain parts of this country. From this ecclesiastical stage Harvard long ago emerged. Of the other types, which does or should the Harvard of to-day represent? On the revised seal of the College, does the "Veritas" printed on the three books lying open on the shield find its full and large expression in the "Christo et Ecclesiæ" set around the shield? Or does the divided "Veritas" keep itself in the books and on the shield wholly

[1] "Harvard Monthly," December, 1892, p. 97.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apart from the "Christo et Ecclesiæ," which words touch neither shield nor book? Does Truth find its full and most definite consummation in Christ and the Church, or do Christ and the Church represent the extreme horizon, remote from the central sun of Truth?[1] These two interpretations of the Harvard seal represent without doubt two large classes of the lovers and admirers of the present administration of the University. The evidence which President Eliot offers leads to the belief that he would prefer that Harvard should stand for that type of Christianity which the State university stands for. Neither can there be any doubt which type of Christianity such a son of Harvard as Phillips Brooks would wish all Harvard graduates to believe in. For, in his 250th Anniversary sermon, the great preacher said:

"Now at her festival, when she gathers all her history up into her consciousness and stands in awe before herself, now is the time for her to boldly recognize her own profounder meaning, to own the Christhood within which she has lived and to give her whole future up to it for government and blessing. My friends, brethren in the love and care of our great mother, let us do that for her. Let us demand of her to do that for herself to-day. What does it mean, to do that? How can she do that, does she ask? Let her remember, let her know, that Christ is law as well as truth; Christ is righteousness as well as revelation."[2]

The one great need of the intellectual, ethical, and religious education which Harvard University gives is the one great need of modern life,—the need of a more vital spiritual impulse and inspiration. The type of Christianity which prevails in the University would be improved, not by being made less broad, but by being touched by an ethical and religious enthusiasm. One would be bold, almost boorish, to say that Harvard would be greatly benefited by an old-fashioned revival of religion; but it is safe and true to say that Harvard does need great religious enthusiasms. It has enthusiasms; but they lie down deep in the depths of semi-consciousness. *Nil admirari* is not the principle of Harvard men so thoroughly as was intimated by the topic of a Sophomore theme given out some years ago. "Harvard indifference" is at least a half-lie. The tablets in Memorial Hall give testimony that Harvard men have enthusiasms, but they also furnish evidence for the remark that only a concern as serious as an imperilled country can evoke the emotion. A vigorous enthusiasm for a broad-

[1] "The motto finally substituted for that ["Veritas"], "Christo et Ecclesiæ," is, when rightfully interpreted, substantially the same, for it means that we are to devote ourselves to the highest conception we have of Truth and to the preaching of it." Lowell, Address on the Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Harvard College. Prose Works, VI. 158.

[2] "Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Harvard College," p. 187.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

church Christianity would do more for the University, and, through the University, for humanity, than all else. What Harvard needs is less religious atmosphere, for this the revered Doctor Peabody furnished so far as he could; but it does need more a great wind of vital Christianity,—a great wind of vital Christianity which Phillips Brooks was; one which shall search out all the intellectual, and ethical, and spiritual recesses of each student's being.

President Eliot is the first example in our time of a new type of university president. It is well that this example should be so magnificent. One can hardly help comparing this best representative of the new with the best representative of the old. This representative is President Hopkins. President Hopkins and President Eliot stand alike for virility, mighty personality, wisdom, comprehensiveness of plan, devotion to duty, and greatness of desire to benefit their fellowmen. But President Hopkins touched men as individuals; President Eliot touches them as a body. President Hopkins was first and last a teacher; President Eliot is first and last an administrator, a man of affairs, an executive. President Hopkins was concerned with men: President Eliot is concerned with means, measures, methods. President Hopkins avoided opposition by removing its causes, or melted opposition by the warmth of his character; President Eliot beats into pieces the icy blocks of opposition by the sheer blows of his mighty will. President Hopkins was distinguished for wisdom; President Eliot is distinguished for strength. The one was the more discreet; the other is the more fearless. President Hopkins elevated the moral and religious above the intellectual, or rather permeated the intellectual with the religious and moral; President Eliot emphasizes more the simple intellectual. President Hopkins began on the moral and religious basis, and so continued; with President Eliot the moral and religious basis has become more conspicuous with the passing years. President Hopkins's baccalaureate sermons treat of man's duty to God; President Eliot's farewells would relate—were they formally spoken—more to a man's doing his duty in this world. President Hopkins's teachings and counsels were religious; President Eliot's are more ethical. The like of President Hopkins we shall not soon see again: and may the need of trying to see one, who shall be sufficiently like and sufficiently unlike the present President of Harvard College to continue his work, be remote.

CHARLES F. THWING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY CHURCH PROPERTY SHOULD BE TAXED.

THE question of the taxation of church property in the United States is bound soon to become a question of great public concern, because it is already of grave importance.

The general theory of all just taxation is reciprocal service. Judge Cooley, in his "Law of Taxation," says:

> "The protection of the government being the consideration for which taxes are demanded, all parties who receive or are entitled to that protection may be called upon to render the equivalent."

Making the state pay tribute to the church, instead of the church to the state, is a glaring self-contradiction in the United States. It theoretically as well as practically adopts the principle of the union of church and state. The American people would rise up in rebellion against direct taxation for church support; but what is exemption from taxation but an indirect state support of the church, a virtual subsidy for its support and at the expense of the general public? The state reimburses itself by increasing the tax on the non-exempted property, and exemption is as clearly a gift as would be the amount of taxes the exempted property should pay if it were directly appropriated from the public treasury. The state avoids a deficiency in its revenues by transferring to other property increased taxation, not by the voluntary action of the taxpayers, but by the compulsion of law, all of which is out of consonance with our republican institutions.

True, the church yields no private income to the corporators. Neither do many other kinds of property. But the state cannot regulate its action by rule of income. Taxation would no doubt in some instances be a burden. But thousands of property-owners now find it difficult to pay their taxes, and yet the state cannot afford to exempt them. Tax churches, and only those churches that are able to pay taxes would dare to be extravagant. With so much poverty and want in the community, our magnificent church edifices and massive buildings for alleged charitable purposes, on our most valuable sites, are a burlesque on both religion and charity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Benjamin Franklin said:

"When a religion is good, I conceive that it will support itself; and when it cannot support itself and God does not take care to support it, so its professors are obliged to call for help from the civil power, it is a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one."

In 1875 President Grant sent a message to Congress on the subject of a total separation of church and state, and the taxation of church property. This message would have been more appropriate for a governor's message addressed to the legislature of a State, for Congress has nothing to do with the question in the exercise of its taxing power. The whole spirit of the Constitution leaves this question to be determined by the respective States. But the President's sentiments were truly American. He said:

"In 1850, I believe, the church property of the United States which paid no tax, municipal or State, amounted to $87,000,000. In 1860 the amount had doubled. In 1870 it was $354,483,587. In 1900, without a check, it is safe to say, this property will reach a sum exceeding $3,000,000,000. So vast a sum, receiving all the protection and benefits of government, without bearing its proportion of the burdens and expenses of the same, will not be looked upon acquiescently by those who have to pay the taxes. In a growing country, where real estate enhances so rapidly with time as in the United States, there is scarcely a limit to the wealth that may be acquired by corporations, religious or otherwise, if allowed to retain real estate without taxation. The contemplation of so vast a property as here alluded to, without taxation, may lead to sequestration without constitutional authority, and through bloodshed. I would suggest the taxation of all property equally."

President Garfield said:

"The divorce between church and state ought to be absolute. It ought to be so absolute that no church property anywhere, in any State, or in the nation, should be exempt from equal taxation; for if you exempt the property of any church organization, to that extent you impose a tax upon the whole community."

The census of 1890 has reported the alleged value of church edifices, the lots on which they stand, and their furnishings, as $680,687,106. The following table shows in detail these values where the aggregate exceeds $4,000,000:

All Methodists	$132,132,304	Disciples of Christ	$12,206,038
All Roman Catholics	118,342,366	Unitarians	10,335,100
All Presbyterians	94,869,097	All Jewish congregations	9,754,275
All Baptists	83,834,272	Universalists	8,060,333
All Episcopalians	82,774,018	All United Brethren	4,937,983
Congregationalists	43,335,437	Evangelical Association	4,785,680
All Lutherans	35,060,354	German Evangelical Synod	4,614,490
All Reformed	18,744,242	All Friends	4,541,334

This table does not include the value of parsonages, lots, monasteries, convents, schools, colleges, and the like; nor are these figures accu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rate, for a conservative estimate of the Roman Catholic "church property" alone is $250,000,000, and of the property of all sects, in this country, $2,000,000,000. Under the head of "church property" millions of dollars' worth of revenue-producing property evades taxation, such as large lots of valuable land upon which there are no buildings, and which are held for revenue, and thousands of mercantile buildings, schools, and even factories. Practically the effect of exemption has been to encourage the church in buying vast tracts of land, which are daily growing in value. Dr. H. L. Wayland cites this instance:

> "I am credibly told that on a recent occasion a bishop went to the owner of a valuable tract in a neighboring county, and said, 'What is the price of such and such a piece of land?' 'Sixty thousand dollars.' 'You have raised the price fifteen thousand dollars?' 'Yes.' 'Very good; here is a check.'"

It was bought for the church simply as an investment.

The Protestant opposition to the taxation of church property comes almost wholly from the Episcopalian and Lutheran churches, which are more or less related to state-supported churches in Europe. Yet there are many advocates of this taxation even among the Lutherans and Episcopalians. But the Roman Catholic church is unanimously opposed to any taxation of its churches, schools, or other property. There are many reasons why its property should especially be taxed.

The property of the Roman Catholic church should be taxed because it is held, not by the people, but by the individual ecclesiastics, and is therefore personal property exclusively under personal control. The anathemas of the Council of Trent are pronounced against all, even the clergy, who will not resist even the state itself, should the state attempt to give laymen, or anybody but priests and bishops, the control of church property. The sixteenth canon of the Council of Baltimore, held in 1852, shows how far a power emanating from Rome exercises influence over church property in this land. Instances could be cited where the curse of excommunication was pronounced against all Roman Catholics who would not give the bishop control of certain property, and the persons resisting the clerical usurpation were assaulted and driven by force upon the Sabbath from the very threshold of the church which they helped to build as a house for their own worship. The churches are held in the name of the bishops, and not in the name of the trustees. It is said that Archbishop Corrigan of New York holds more than $50,000,000 worth of real estate in his own name. There have been numerous transfers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of property from trustees to M. A. Corrigan: not to M. A. Corrigan, Archbishop, nor to M. A. Corrigan as trustee for the Roman Catholic church, but simply to M. A. Corrigan. Many of these parcels cover whole squares of land, and nearly all of them are of great value. The Pope's nuncio, Bedini, came to America in 1855 to wrest the church property of Roman Catholics from the hands of the trustees and to place it in the hands of the bishops. It was because the title was vested in the bishop that the trustees of Roman Catholic churches in 1855 prayed the New York State legislature for redress, and the State answered that those who build the churches with their own money can govern the church temporalities as they please, and to-day the one-man power of the Archbishop prevails over the sovereign law of the State of New York. Because the Roman Catholic bishops are the owners in fee simple of nearly all the church property within their respective ecclesiastical jurisdictions, and have the legal right to control, possess, and use it by assignment, by will, or otherwise, therefore their property should be taxed as personal property, or at least be deeded back to the worshippers.

Calvary Cemetery, though nominally under the name or title of the Trustees of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York city, is in reality Archbishop Corrigan's own property. It is unlawful and against the discipline of the Archbishop to bury anywhere but in the Archbishop's cemetery. Like a true monopolist he commands his own price and terms for lots, graves, tombstone fees, etc., for his own benefit; and I have been told by those who ought to know that the sums received have been at times as much as $2,000 a day. It seems to me that the Archbishop ought to pay a tax on the receipts.

The legitimate result of exemption has been the bestowment of public money upon the Roman Catholic church and its institutions. The money donated by the city of New York to the Roman Catholic church (to say nothing of the five and a half blocks of land in the best parts of the city, now worth $5,000,000), from 1869 to 1883 inclusive, was $8,555,250.39; from 1884 to 1893 inclusive, $5,526,-733.34. Protestant denominations received during the ten years 1884 to 1893 inclusive, $365,467.34. The New York State legislature for the year 1890 appropriated to sixteen institutions under Roman Catholic control $1,079,986.07; to all other denominational institutions, numbering twenty-eight, $946,649.67. The amount of public money granted from the United States Treasury for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roman Catholic Indian Missions, compared with the niggardly amounts given to other denominations, deserves notice:

	Total in 9 years
Roman Catholic	$2,738,571
Presbyterian	346,120
Congregational	217,269
Martinsburg, Pa.	23,310
Alaska Training School	8,350
Episcopal	110,166
Friends	160,557
Mennonite	29,590
Middletown, Cal.	1,523
Carried forward	$3,635,456

	Total in 9 years
Brought forward	$3,635,456
Lutheran, Wittenberg, Wis.	68,580
Unitarian	39,150
Methodist	33,345
Mrs. L. H. Daggett	6,480
Miss Howard	9,375
Lincoln Institution	300,600
Hampton Institute	180,360
Total	$4,273,346

These appropriations are in violation of both the letter and the spirit of the first Amendment to the Constitution. It is earnestly hoped that all Protestant denominations will decline to receive further appropriations from the United States, so that they can consistently protest against the excessive grants to Roman Catholic schools. As an American I am opposed to this whole business, as recognizing the principle of a union of church and state. Let each church support its own schools and charities, with its own money and not the money of others. The principle is wrong, for Protestant and Romanist alike, the latter sinning only more shamelessly than the former.

Wherever you look, Roman Catholic church property is rapidly multiplying; and where the Protestant churches get lots, the Roman Catholics get blocks,—entire squares,—and hold them against all comers. Taxation or confiscation is inevitable.

Indeed, from the earliest days of the church, every chapter in its history teaches the lesson of the danger of its policy as a great property-holder with special privileges.

The church derived her right to hold property from the civil power. Constantine the Great, great only in his sins, received his title of Great because he provided by a civil law, still held sacred, that temporal power of the See of Rome, which made Dante sing: "O Constantine, how much evil originated, not from thy conversion, but from that grant from thee to the first Pope whom thou madest rich." And in less than fifty years from that time the priests of Italy had gained one-third of the soil of that country. In 1857 one-third of the real estate in Mexico belonged to the church, besides more than $300,000,000 of other property in that poor country, and its revenues were greater than those of the Mexican government. When the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

property of the church was placed upon the market, its actual value was sufficient to pay the national debt several times. In Chili the saints nominally hold property. St. Dominick has an income of more than a million dollars a year, for which he is not taxed one cent. In Catholic Guatemala the property of the church was confiscated in 1843; then there was a reaction led by the priests, but in 1873 all the church property of Guatemala passed into the hands of the government. In Catholic Costa Rica, Venezuela, and Uruguay, the governments took the property away from the church, applied it to governmental purposes, and in some cases gave it to the people from whom the priests had stolen it.

In Canada, during the short time between the settlement by the French and the conquest by the English, the priests had gotten in their hands more than eight million acres of land. In the Province of Quebec, the exemption of church property from taxation has become a serious question. A careful writer, in speaking recently of the excommunication of certain outspoken French papers in Montreal, said:

"One of the great crimes committed by the excommunicated papers was that they spoke against the provision which exempts religious corporations from taxes. The city of Montreal is invaded by religious orders of every description, possessing immense properties. These orders buy up the most eligible sites and erect costly edifices for the propagation of their views. Often the property they buy brings a handsome revenue to the city in the shape of taxes. But as soon as this property is handed over to the Romish church, it becomes untaxable. The richer the church becomes, the poorer the city grows."

The great quantity of untaxed church property in Montreal is driving out the Protestant minority who pay three-fourths of the taxes. The English in that city own the enterprises without which the Province of Quebec, left to the absolute domination of ecclesiasticism, would be as backward as Ecuador. These English enterprises are taxed remorselessly. There is over $100,000,000 worth of exempted ecclesiastical property in the Province. The English have to pay for these exemptions by increased taxation. When the treasury is empty, the cry is, "Tax the English corporations." It is a hopeful sign that there is a growing and strong feeling among the liberal Catholics that all these rich religious corporations should pay taxes. Another writer, referring to the same Province, says:

"There are municipalities where 50 per cent of the whole assessed value is exempt, and others where the value of the property exempted actually exceeds that of the property taxed. Besides, we have to contribute to support religious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orders, or see our stores and shops boycotted. The Provincial treasurer is drawn on to provide for a great many of them. I might say that the Church spends or oversees the spending of one-third of the whole Provincial revenues, less the subsidies from Ottawa."

I have quoted thus at length from the Province of Quebec, because the principle there is the same as here, the Roman Catholic church simply lacking the power to enforce its demands in the United States as it does in Quebec. Had church property been taxed, Quebec would not now be bankrupt, nor would the church have sunk that Province into its present deplorable state.

Other denominations also are in danger of amassing wealth. Why should not the great estates of Trinity and the Collegiate churches of New York city, or Old South Church in Boston, held as investments for income instead of direct church uses, be taxed? The spirit of our laws is opposed to exemptions, and there needs to be made out a very strong case to justify an exemption from taxation of property owned by corporations like these. Common honesty should lead them to bear their share of that taxation which provides a constant increase of value. All buildings rented for income, even though that income be devoted to religion and charity, should be taxed. R. J. Long, Esq., of Boston, says that in that city the churches hold $40,000,000 of exempted property. The assessed value of New York city church property, exclusive of parsonages, parsons, and priests, is $51,217,525. Walk up Broadway from Rector Street and up Fifth Avenue, and from these streets alone you can see to what extent the church property in New York is underestimated. $200,000,000 is less than the actual value of the church property of the metropolis, and when we remember that the assessed value of the real estate of New York city for 1894 is but $1,618,853,135, it can easily be figured out how highly oppressive exemption becomes to the other taxpayers.

It is claimed that churches should be exempted because they improve the morals of the community, and raise the taxable value of the other property. That depends altogether on the church. But admit the fact that churches, as a rule, are a public benefit; so are private schools, picture-galleries, and factories, yet such property cannot be exempted without starving the state. Why, then, should churches enjoy this favor on the ground of benefits rendered; and other property, that can assign the same reason for the favor, be excluded therefrom? If the doctrine of benefits be given as a reason

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for exemption in behalf of religious corporations, it refutes itself by proving more than the state can admit. The New York City Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments, in their annual report for 1893, speaking of the injustice of this species of legislation, say:

> "Corporations and associations avail themselves of these laws and decisions of the courts to escape taxation to such an extent that the public authorities must soon demand relief from the legislature."

Tax churches, and modest buildings will be erected where they are most needed, instead of building one great structure in a fashionable quarter. Churches are said to be public property. But the Roman Catholic churches charge an admission fee to the ordinary service. High money, high mass; low money, low mass; no money, no mass. In many Protestant churches the pew-rents are so high and the people so exclusive that the public feel that they are not wanted. I would tax all charitable institutions, hospitals, and orphanages. Their work is not wholly philanthropic. They receive revenue. In New York city, orphanages are maintained at public expense. "The Foundling Asylum," under the charge of the Sisters of Charity, received during the years 1884 to 1893, inclusive, from the "Taxation and General Fund," $2,641,998.02. During the same period and from the same fund the "New York Catholic Protectory" received $2,462,500. Many of these so-called orphans have both parents living, and the Church is maintaining them at the expense of the taxpayers, and making an enormous profit, the appropriations being five times in excess of the expense of providing for such "orphans." It is a sad sight to see a congregation, whose combined wealth is millions, pleading exemption for their orphanage. My mother was left a widow with three little orphans to care for. Her little country home was taxed. If any orphanage should be exempt from taxation, such a one as that ought to be.

The taxation of church property is in the interest of American principles, and in harmony with the experience of nations. Taxing one man for the propagation of another man's religion is glaringly unjust. Moreover it is a relic of the principle of the union of church and state inherited from the Old World, and not yet eliminated from our political system.

MADISON C. PETERS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS FAITH IN A FUTURE LIFE DECLINING?

ARE faith and interest in the future life, and in those spiritual facts which a belief in it involves, growing forces among our people?

I have been asked to throw a side-light on this question from the point of view of a special experience. Since to certain minds illustration is better than argument, while to many they are identical, I must regret that I have so little material to present of the kind particularly requested, and that I must substitute for it chiefly a simple expression of the belief which the possession of such material has helped to form.

It befell me, about a year ago, to make an allusion to the letters from unknown readers called forth more than twenty-five years ago by the publication of "The Gates Ajar"; and I am asked what reply these may have helped to give to the question heading this brief paper.

It should be said at once that these letters—thousands in number and coming from all quarters of the globe, from almost every nationality, all stations in life, all degrees of intelligence, all phases of culture, all ages and stages of human experience—have been destroyed. Had this not been the case their publication would have been a doubtful and delicate question: since one may fail to see the reason why the confidences of a stranger are not to be respected as well as those of a friend. These letters, it should be understood, were and are chiefly from two kinds of writers: the bereaved and the perplexed. When one reflects how large a variety of human beings these types compass, one perceives that the recipient would be more than dull or wilful to whom such a correspondence had not been educational. It is the result of this bit of special training which is given in these few pages.

It can be said, in a word, that this experience, so far as it goes, has not offered evidence of a general decline in that impulse of mind which we may venture to call spiritual attentiveness. Of course, the present movement of a book already a generation in circulation does not produce the same amount of response, but continues to produce the same proportion of response to the truths with which it dealt. This response has undergone certain modifications, and has become

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more significant of deep, underlying currents working their way from dark mines of faith to the unseen, upper air.

Twenty years ago the author of a popular work upon a subject as engrossing as the future life, would have been more likely to be overwhelmed with the appeal of simple, personal bereavement, or with merely natural curiosity about the hereafter. His recognition would have been chiefly divided between the cries of despair and the smiles of hope and gratitude. Such letters covered every phase of religious development, as well as every type of humanity. I remember the colored girl in the reformatory, literally the one black sheep in the institution, the rebel whom nobody could manage, till, on a chance reading of the book that better girls have cast aside with no appreciable interest, she deliberately announced: "If Heaven is a place like *that*, I want to go,—and I mean to"; and who on the testimony of her teacher became from that hour docile, studious, pure, and gentle, with an intelligence which shames her mental and moral superiors, setting forth for the Celestial City and singing by the way.

I recall receiving, in the same mail, the few memorable words of some man of affairs or of public influence. It is a mistake often made to suppose that books of the sort referred to depend chiefly on women or on feminine sensibility for their recognition. I doubt if it is generally known or believed how often men of the world are touched by sincere, religious work, and how willing they are to say so. I think I can speak with some authority on this point, and I am glad to add my testimony, for whatever it may be worth, to the spiritual candor of the less religious sex.

Piled above such letters from such extremes of life as these, lay the appeals of the mourning, black of edge, and blurred with tears, a mass high beneath the hand and heavy to the heart. It was the cry of the king in the chamber over the gate. It was the moan in the darkness for the slain first-born. It was the outcry of desolated husband and of heart-broken wife. It was the anguish of widowed maid, of orphaned youth, of friend bereft. These letters had the terrible and unanswerable power of all great, natural voices; and "the chiefest of these are" love and grief. Year upon year the recipient has sat dumb before these signs of human misery and hope. They have rolled upon the shore of life, a billow of solemn inspiration. I have elsewhere called them the human argument for faith in the future life; and see no reason for amending the term.

If asked more closely to define whatever change may be said to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have passed upon the general nature of these indices of popular thought and feeling, as occupied with the unseen life, I should say that there has been a slow but perceptible movement in the direction of the intellectual, and somewhat away from the more emotional aspects of the subject. It would be safe to observe that a less proportion of such recognition from unknown readers now expends itself in the simple outcry of grief; a larger proportion extends itself into religious speculation.

The piteous appeal does not so often stop at: "Give me comfort, or I perish!" but moves on to: "Give me faith, and the reasons for it, for I would live!" There is perhaps less demand for sympathy, more for belief; less dependence, more investigation; less blind handling of the merely personal problem of bereavement, more reaching after the larger life of a faith too strong to be shattered by individual pain. It is difficult to generalize accurately from such floating data, but such are my impressions, and I can but give them as they stand. An interesting instance of the facts that have formed them occurred so recently as to have some special illustrative value. A stranger, a man, apparently an educated one, writes to this effect (his letter, like the rest, is destroyed, and its tenor can be only given from memory):

I am an old man. I have lived almost my limit of threescore and ten, and I have come to this age without belief in immortality and without faith in the Christian religion. I now begin to see the end of life approaching, and it makes me uncomfortable. I am not afraid of death, but I should be a happier man if I could see any reason to think that I knew something of what lies beyond it. I have studied this subject for years as honestly as I know how. I have never received any light upon it. Dissatisfied with my own efforts, I have appealed by letter to certain prominent clergymen—men whose business it is to enlighten those who have not the happiness to share their faith and their hope. In no case have I received any satisfactory reply. In most I have received none at all. I now appeal to a woman who seems to be sincere, and, as a religious teacher, I ask you: Can you answer me these questions?

Then follow the usual problems of the confirmed doubter: neither more nor less difficult to answer. The letter closes with this extraordinary proposition:

If you can and will reply to my difficulties so as to give me any real light upon them, I shall be ready to go in peace, a happy man; and to prove that I am in earnest in what I say, I should be glad in such case to provide an education for any ten young people whom you should select and name to me for that purpose.

It may not be out of place to pause for the natural inquiry: Was this letter answered? Assuredly it was; but, unfortunately,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after an enforced delay of such time, that what appeared to be a traveller's address may not have been overtaken; and if I may be allowed to take this, the only way open to me now, of reaching the unknown correspondent, I should like—if this page ever meets his eye—to acquaint him with the fact that his challenge was accepted, and his questions answered "to the best of my knowledge and belief." If his appeal was genuine, it would be worth while for him to know that it was not discarded. If otherwise, it is quite unimportant whether he knows it or not. But, how often in a lifetime do we regret assuming that a man means to be honest when he seeks the guidance of his better nature?

This brings us to another point which weighs strongly upon the mind of one whom any special experience or training has led into the study of modern doubt and faith. I refer to the greatly-increasing demand for simple and absolute sincerity in the souls of those who undertake to be, in any interpretation of the term, religious teachers.

The time has gone by when mere theology can blindfold common sense, or when cold ecclesiasticism can mislead earnest struggle. It is just as true that mere mysticism, or vague emotionalism, or self-deception, or spiritual laziness have no part or lot in the great process of spiritual illumination now silently broadening throughout the world.

Nothing in the whole course of the special experience referred to has so vividly impressed me as the imperious insistence of the people upon clear-cut, positive, honest faith in the hearts of their spiritual guides. Hundreds of unknown friends and jurors have spoken only to say this: "Do you believe what you have written? Are you speaking God's truth, or playing with a delusion? Do you teach us your own creed? From your soul, is this your soul's faith?" Then comes the startling and solemn challenge: "If you believe—we believe." All religious teachers—nay, all believing souls—know the grave force of challenges like these. Trust is the final argument for deserving trust. Sincerity is, I sometimes think, the one only absolute essential to spiritual power. To express belief in the simple terms of conviction; never to advance by a shade or an accent beyond; never to be lured into affirming what is expected because it is expected, or into conforming to precedent because it is the religious fashion; to say what one is sure of, and no more; to handle the sacred fire for one's neighbor as for one's own soul,—this is spiritual honor; and by it he who bears the name of Christ must expect and deserves to be judged. "He who honors his word as if it were his God's," is a great Chris-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tian poet's definition of a true man. As long as the world spins through the dark, human hearts will honor honor and have faith in faith; and human belief will follow the believers who know what they think, and are not afraid to say so, and are afraid to say anything else.

Is faith in the unseen life increasing? The personal lesson learned in this direction is soon recited. The larger answers to the question all lie beyond the personal range, and some of them weigh upon the pausing pen.

It is only possible, however, now and here to suggest that a careful study of the present conditions of the higher life of our people will reveal significant signs, intelligible to the eye that is educated to read them and wishes to do so. Our popular literature presents some striking features of the subject. Our present phases of benevolence tell their own strong story. The growth of interest in psychical research means much. Theosophy and fashionable forms of mysticism signify something. The enormous advance of organized religious associations, the present tolerance of intelligence and culture for popular forms of Christian usefulness hitherto ignored or scorned, mean more.

After all, the kingdom of God is within us. No argument, no illustration, no conclusion can convince the worldly, the paltry, or the spiritually vulgar of the reality, the power, and the silent advance of the spiritual life. And he who lives that life needs none of "all these things" to confirm his faith in it. He knows his descent, and recognizes his kin. It was a true philosopher, a great genius, and a woman of the world who said: "A soul without faith is like an open bottle of which the precious essence escapes or is deteriorated." The distance between the soul and truth is always shorter than it seems; and the Hand that leads across the dark spaces in which faith goes wandering and belief gets lost, is strong. We do not, because we cannot see him, refuse to follow the guide who comes to our rescue in the dark.

The mightiest powers of the world are invisible ones. Faith in the unseen is faith in force. Its growth proceeds as other growth does, by nutrition. It calls for at least as much respect, opportunity, and nurture, as the growth of hothouse fruit or a blooded horse. He who gives it less attention than he gives the instructions of his fencing-master or the politics of his party, will not find himself a qualified juror in any trial of the great and noble claims of the inner life upon the allegiance, the intelligence, or the trust of the world.

ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED